A HANDBOOK OF SOCIALISM

W. D. P. BLISS.

Library of Princeton
JAN 22 1896
Theological Seminary

Division HX40
Section .B64
No.

A HANDBOOK OF SOCIALISM.

A HANDBOOK OF SOCIALISM

A STATEMENT OF SOCIALISM IN ITS VARIOUS ASPECTS, AND
A HISTORY OF SOCIALISM IN ALL COUNTRIES, TOGETHER
WITH STATISTICS, BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON
PROMINENT SOCIALISTS, BIBLIOGRAPHY,
CALENDAR, CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE
AND CHART

BY

W. D. P. BLISS

EDITOR OF "THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF SOCIAL REFORM"

LONDON
SWAN SONNENSCHEIN & CO.
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1895

"ALL FOR THE CAUSE."

"*For the Cause alone is worthy, till the good days bring the best.*"

WILLIAM MORRIS.

PREFACE.

In an experience, now continuing over some years, of trying to extend the knowledge and acceptance of the principles of Socialism, the author has felt the lack of any *one book* to which he could refer readers for a statement of both the principles and the historical developments of modern Socialism. He has, therefore, endeavoured, in the limits of one small volume, to condense as much as possible of the principles of Socialism in its various aspects, and of the history of the movement in all countries. In bibliographical notes and in appendices, he has endeavoured to direct those who would read further on any point, where to go.

This book is meant for a popular handbook for English and American readers, rather than for scholars; the references therefore are, in the main, only to available books in English. In German, Drs. Stegmann and Hugo's *Handbuch des Socialismus*, and Bernstein and Kautsky's *Die Geschichte des Sozialismus*, both now appearing in parts, are perhaps the best books, and are excellent, yet needing to be frequently supplemented. On many points connected with the Socialist movement there do not exist authoritative sources; mistakes, therefore, will arise. The author of this book will be greatly indebted for any corrections that may be sent him (to the care of the publishers).

He desires simply to add that the Socialist views expressed in this book are not his own. Agreeing, to a large extent, with the Socialist analysis, economic programme and ideal, he still differs *radically* from the Socialism presented in this volume. He differs from it *at the root.* He believes that no Socialism can be successful unless rooted and grounded in Christ, the Liberator, the Unifier, because the Head of Humanity. The Church he believes to be the world's first, greatest, and necessary International. Modern Socialism he believes to have sprung from Christianity; but, largely through the fault of Christians, to have become disowned by most Christians to-day, and thus driven into hostility to its Mother—a condition which he believes will endure till the Church awakes and introduces into the world a Socialism that is grounded in Christ. Till then, he believes that Socialism will only find a modicum of success, with mainly negative results to drive the world to Christ.

A few chapters, however, which the author had written upon Christian Socialism for this book have been omitted; the subject is so large that they will be expanded into a book by themselves, which, by the kindness of the publishers of this volume, the author is already permitted to announce.

He desires in closing to acknowledge his indebtedness to Messrs. Edward R. Pease, H. Quelch, Halliday Sparling, John Trevor, Robert A. Peddie, Domela Nieuwenhuis, Wilhelm Liebknecht, and many others. Among books he has made particular use of the German *Handbuch* referred to above, various Fabian publications, Prof. Ely's works on American subjects, and the Foreign Reports of the Royal Commission on Labour, with constant reference to the Socialist literature and press of the various Socialist parties of different countries.

W. D. P. BLISS.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER PAGE

I. DEFINITIONS OF SOCIALISM - - - - - - 1

Alphabetically arranged by authors.

II. WHAT SOCIALISM IS NOT - - - - - - 7

(a) *Not governmentalism or paternalism.*
(b) *Not a systematising of society.*
(c) *Not Co-operation.*
(d) *Not Communism.*
(e) *Not Anarchism.*
(f) *Not Anarchist-Communism.*

III. WHAT SOCIALISM IS - - - - - - - 17

A principle of social action—Perfectly definite in principle, perfectly flexible in form—Varying in different countries and at different times, but always that principle according to which society should own land and capital collectively, and operate it co-operatively for the equitable good of all—Various Socialist ideals.

IV. THE HISTORY OF SOCIALISM IN GENERAL - - - 39

The origin and beginnings of Socialism—The Utopian period—The period of Inaction—The period of the International—The present period of political Social Democracy—International Congresses.

V. SOCIALISM IN ENGLAND - - - - - - - 50

VI. SOCIALISM IN FRANCE - - - - - - - 71

VII. SOCIALISM IN GERMANY - - - - - - - 83

VIII. SOCIALISM IN BELGIUM - - - - - - - 111

IX. SOCIALISM IN SWITZERLAND - - - - - - 120

X. SOCIALISM IN THE UNITED STATES - - - - - 131

XI. SOCIALISM IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND - - - 150

XII. SOCIALISM IN OTHER COUNTRIES - - - - - 154

Austria-Hungary—The Balkan States—Denmark—Holland—Italy—Norway and Sweden—Russia—Spain.

CHAPTER PAGE

XIII. SOCIALISM AND THE POLITICAL ECONOMISTS - - - 172

Socialists of the Chair—Quotations from Political Economists.

XIV. SOCIALISM THE ONLY SOLUTION OF THE INDUSTRIAL PROBLEM 182

Mere Trades Unionism, mere Co-operation, Profit-sharing, mere Charity, mere Land Nationalisation or Taxation, not sufficient —Anarchism presents no hope.

XV. OBJECTIONS TO SOCIALISM - - - - - - 192

(a) *That Socialism is impracticable.*
(b) *That it is undesirable, because it would check individuality and individual freedom.*
(c) *That it would result in over-population, or, if this be prevented, in deterioration of the race.*
(d) *That it is Utopian and far away.*

APPENDICES.

A. Biographical Notes on Socialist Writers and Leaders, alphabetically arranged - - - - - - 205
B. A Brief Bibliography of Socialism - - - - 264
C. Socialist Papers and Magazines - - - - - 284
D. A Socialist Calendar - - - - - - - - 287
E. Chronology of Socialistic Literature - - - - 290
Chart - - - - - - - - - - 293

CHAPTER I.

THE DEFINITION OF SOCIALISM.

ALL Socialists and all authorities upon Socialism are agreed as to what Socialism is. This is shown by the following quotations, all of which, though using different expressions, are in well-nigh absolute agreement. As Sidney Webb has pointed out, not to know what Socialism is, is to-day simply intellectual laziness. Socialism is not paternalism, nor the expansion of State activity, nor the regimentation of life, nor the adoption of a fixed form of society, nor even the co-operation of arbitrary groups of workers, nor the total abolition of competition, nor the leaping into a Utopia of brotherly love, nor the sudden and violent overturn of existing institutions. SOCIALISM IS THE FIXED PRINCIPLE, CAPABLE OF INFINITE AND CHANGING VARIETY OF FORM, AND ONLY GRADUALLY TO BE APPLIED, ACCORDING TO WHICH THE COMMUNITY SHOULD OWN LAND AND CAPITAL COLLECTIVELY AND OPERATE THEM CO-OPERATIVELY FOR THE EQUITABLE GOOD OF ALL.

See the following definitions :—

ARISTOTLE. *Politics*, bk. i., 2, §§ 12-14 :—

The State is, by nature, clearly prior to the individual and to the family, since the whole is of necessity prior to the part. . . . The proof that the State is a creation of nature, and prior to the individual, is that the individual, when isolated, is not self-sufficing ; and therefore he is like a part in relation to the whole. But he who is unable to live in society, or who has no need because he is sufficient for himself, must be either a beast or a god.

BELLAMY, EDWARD (Nationalist) :—

Industrial self-government is a very convenient and accurate definition of Nationalism.

Century Dictionary :—

Socialism is any theory or system of social organisation which would abolish entirely or in great part the individual effort and competition on which modern society rests, and substitute for it co-operative action; would introduce a more perfect and equal distribution of the products of labour, and would make land and capital, as the instruments and means of production, the joint possession of the members of the community.

CLARKE, WILLIAM. *Political Science Quarterly*, Dec., 1888 :—

A Socialist is one who believes that the necessary instruments of production should be held and organised by the community, instead of by individuals, or groups of individuals, within or outside of the community.

ELY, PROF. RICHARD T. *Socialism and Social Reform*, p. 19 :—

The results of the analysis of Socialism may be brought together in a definition which would read somewhat as follows: *Socialism is that contemplated system of industrial society which proposes the abolition of private property in the great material instruments of production, and the substitution therefor of collective property; and advocates the collective management of production, together with the distribution of social income by society, and private property in the larger proportion of this social income.*

ENGELS, FREDERICK. *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, trans. by E. Aveling, thus briefly describes Socialism :—

With the seizing of the means of production by society, production of commodities is done away with, and simultaneously the mastery of the product over the producer. Anarchy in social production is replaced by systematic, definite organisation. The struggle for individual existence disappears. . . . The whole sphere of the conditions which environ man, and which have hitherto ruled man, now comes under the dominion and control of man, who now for the first time becomes the real conscious lord of Nature, because he has now become master of his own social organisation. . . . It is the ascent of man from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom.

KIDD, BENJAMIN. *Social Evolution*, p. 207 :—

True Socialism has one invariable characteristic by which it may be always recognised . . . always one definite object in view, up to which all its proposals directly or indirectly lead. This is the final suspension of that personal struggle for existence which has been waged not only from the beginning of society, but, in one form or another, from the beginning of life.

KIRKUP, THOMAS. In *Encyclopædia Britannica* :—

Whereas industry is at the present carried on by private capitalists served by wage labour, it must be in the future conducted by associated or co-operating work—men jointly owning the means of production. On grounds both of theory and history this must be accepted as the cardinal principle of Socialism.

KIRKUP, THOMAS. *An Inquiry into Socialism*, pp. 11-12 :—

The essence of Socialism is this: it proposes that industry be carried on by associated labourers jointly owning the means of production (land and capital). Whereas industry is at present conducted by private and competing capitalists served by wage labour, it must in the future be carried on by associated labour, with a collective capital, and with a view to an equitable system of distribution.

LAFARGUE, PAUL (Marxist). In *Le Figaro* :—

Socialism is not the system of any reformer whatever; it is the doctrine of those who believe that the existing system is on the eve of a fatal economic evolution which will establish collective ownership in the hands of organisations of workers, in place of the individual ownership of capital. Socialism is of the character, therefore, of an historical discovery.

MILL, JOHN STUART. *Fortnightly Review*, April, 1879 :—

What is characteristic of Socialism is the joint ownership by all the members of the community of the instruments and means of production, which carries with it the consequence that the division of all the produce among the body of owners must be a public act performed according to rules laid down by the community.

SCHÄFFLE, PROF. A. E. T. *Quintessence of Socialism* :—

The Alpha and Omega of Socialism is the transformation of private and competing capitals into a united collective capital.

Again :—

To replace the system of private capital (that is, the speculative method of production, regulated on behalf of society only by the free competition of private enterprises) by a system of collective capital, that is by a method of production which would introduce a unified (social or "collective") organisation, national income on the basis of collective or common ownership of the means of production by all the members of the society. This collective method of production would remove the present competitive system, by placing under official administration such departments of production as can be managed collectively (socially or co-operatively), as well as the distribution among all of the common products of all, according to the amount and social utility of the productive labour of each.

SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION (English) states its objects to be :—

The socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, to be controlled by a democratic State in the interests of the entire community, and the complete emancipation of labour from the domination of capitalism and landlordism, with the establishment of social and economic equality between the sexes.

WAGNER, PROF. ADOLPH :—

Socialism is a principle which regulates social and economic life according to the needs of society as a whole, or which makes provision for the satisfaction of those needs; whereas, individualism is a principle which, in social and economic life, places the individual in the foreground, takes the individual as a starting-point, and makes his interests and wishes the rule for society. . . . Extreme Socialism, or the modern scientific, economic Socialism, is a system of economic legal order opposed to the present order. Socialism demands that the material means of production, that is, land and capital, should not be, as at present, mostly the private property of single private members of the social body, but should be the collective property of society itself; that, consequently, private undertakings designed to secure profit should not stand on one side, and wage-earners, paid according to the conditions of the labour contract, on the other, these various undertakings and wage-earners competing with one another; that production should not be conducted by individual capitalistic managers according to their individual estimate of demand, which means, on the whole, an unregulated production dependent upon the course of speculation and the influences of chance, and that the distribution of the product should take place according to the accidents of the law of supply and demand. Socialism requires, on the contrary, that production should take place according to plans based upon the carefully ascertained demand of the consumers, and that it should be duly regulated by public authority; that it should be carried on in a co-operative manner, or in State and municipal institutions, etc., and that the product should be divided among the producers in a juster manner than at present, when the distribution is effected by means of the law of demand and supply.

WALLAS, GRAHAM. *Fabian Essays*, p. 133 :—

Socialists work for the owning of the means of production by the community and the means of consumption by individuals.

WESTCOTT, BISHOP B. F. *Address before Hull Congress*, 1890:—

Individualism regards humanity as made up of disconnected or warring atoms. Socialism regards it as an organic whole. . . . The aim of Socialism is the fulfilment of service; the aim of individualism is the attainment of some personal advantage—riches, place, or fame. Socialism seeks such an organisation of life as shall secure for every one the most complete development of his powers; individualism seeks primarily the satisfaction of the particular wants of each one, in the hope that the pursuit of private interests will, in the end, secure public welfare.

Further on in the same address Dr. Westcott asserts that:—

The goal of human endeavour is the common well-being of all alike, sought through conditions which provide for the fullest culture of each man as opposed to the special development of a race or a class, by the sacrifice of others in slavery or serfdom, or necessary subjection.

He speaks of this as the central idea of Socialism.

From the MANIFESTO of the JOINT COMMITTEE of the (English) SOCIALIST BODIES:—

It is, therefore, opportune to remind the public once more what Socialism means to those who are working for the transformation of our present unsocialist state into a collectivist republic, and who are entirely free from the illusion that the amelioration or "moralisation" of the conditions of capitalist private property can do away with the necessity for abolishing it. Even those readjustments of industry and administration which are socialist in form will not be permanently useful, unless the whole State is merged into an organised commonwealth. Municipalisation, for instance, can only be accepted as Socialism on the condition of its forming a part of national, and, at last, of international Socialism, in which the workers of all nations, while adopting within the borders of their own countries those methods which are rendered necessary by their historic development, can federate upon a common basis of the collective ownership of the great means and instruments of the creation and distribution of wealth, and thus break down national animosities by the solidarity of human interest throughout the civilised world.

On this point all Socialists agree. Our aim, one and all, is to obtain for the whole community complete ownership and control of the means of transport, the means of manufacture, the mines, and the land. Thus we look to put an end for ever to the wage system, to sweep away all distinctions of class, and eventually to establish national and international Communism on a sound basis.

Those who signed the manifesto were :—

Alfred Beasley.
Samuel Bullock.
J. E. Dobson.
W. S. De Mattos.
W. H. Grant.
H. M. Hyndman.
William Morris.
Touzeau Parris.
Harry Quelch.
H. B. Rogers.
Geo. Bernard Shaw.
Willie Utley.
Sidney Webb.
Ernest E. Williams.
Sydney Olivier.

The Joint Committee of the Social-Democratic Federation, the Fabian Society, and the Hammersmith Socialist Society.

Signed on behalf of the under-mentioned bodies :—

H. W. Lee, *Secretary, Social Democratic Federation,* 337 Strand, W.C.
Edward R. Pease, *Secretary, Fabian Society,* 276 Strand, W.C.
Emery Walker, *Secretary, Hammersmith Socialist Society,* Kelmscott House, Hammersmith.

CHAPTER II.

WHAT SOCIALISM IS NOT.

(*a*) SOCIALISM IS NOT GOVERNMENTALISM OR PATERNALISM.

IN not one of the definitions from the authorities quoted in chapter i. does the word "government" appear, save in the phrase self-government. If these writers then, or if Socialists themselves, know anything about Socialism, *Socialism is not turning things over to the State*, *to the municipality*, *or to government of any kind.* By the derivation of the word from the Latin *socius*, an associate, by its history, by its use by Socialists themselves, Socialism is *essentially* fraternal, the very opposite of paternalism. All the great Socialists have been democrats; they have opposed paternalism; they have opposed paternal governments and the extension of such governments; some of them have opposed the State altogether. Robert Owen, Fourier, Blanqui, Louis Blanc, Karl Marx, Lassalle, Maurice, Hyndman, William Morris—where is there a paternalist or a governmentalist among the great Socialists? In Germany the Socialists all vote against the State insurance schemes of the imperial government; in France the Socialists favour the maintenance for a while of peasant proprietorship, fearing that till the government become thoroughly socialised, to nationalise land would give the State too much power. If Socialists would largely use the State to realise their ideals, it is only because they would make the State first democratic. *If* the State be the community democratically or fraternally organised, then Socialists believe in the State, otherwise not. To call paternalism Socialism is, therefore, hopelessly to confuse. The so-called State Socialism of the German Empire, with its State insurance schemes, etc., was introduced to defeat Socialism. Said Herr Liebknecht at the Socialist Congress at Berlin in November, 1892: "Social democracy has nothing in common with the so-called State Socialism, a system of half measures dictated by fear and aiming merely at undermining the hold of social democracy over the working classes by petty concessions and palliatives". To Socialists the State is a means, not an end. Says Prof. Ely (*Socialism and Social Reform*, p. 33): "Characteristic of the Socialism of to-day is the general desire, on the part of Socialists, to reduce the functions of government to a minimum. There is a general agreement among them that there should be as little government as is compatible with their main ends. They all favour whatever government or regulation is necessary to secure the Socialistic production and distribution of wealth; and they will endorse all those measures which are held to be necessary to guarantee opportunities to all, for the full development of all their faculties. But beyond this they will not go, and they continually seek to devise plans for the accomplishment of these ends with the least possible exercise of governmental authority. It can safely be said that, outside the educational and economic spheres, they advocate a general *laissez faire*, or non-interference policy. The State Church, for example, is not of necessity incompatible with Socialism; but, as a matter of fact, Socialist parties invariably oppose anything of the kind; and the German social democrats, in their platform, expressly declare religion to be a private matter."

Friedrich Engels says (*Die Entwicklung des Sozialismus von der Utopie zur Wissenschaft*): "The first act in which the State really appears as the representative of society as a whole, namely, the seizure of the means of production in the name of society, is at the same time its last independent act as a State. Interference of the State in social relations gradually becomes superfluous in one department after another, and finally of itself ceases (goes to sleep). The place of government over persons is taken by administration of things and the management of productive processes."

Bebel (*Die Frau und Sozialismus*, pp. 312-314) argues that under Socialism, ministers, parliaments, armies, police, courts, attorneys, taxation, will all disappear, their place being taken by administrative colleges or boards. Even when English or American Socialists declare for the State they mean the same as German Socialists in declaring against it. Both denounce the paternal State, both favour a truly democratic, collectivist organisation of the people.

It is for the same reason that all Socialists are working for the decentralisation of government. They wish to transfer functions from central governments to local political units, in order that the business of the people may be near the people. County Councils, Local Government bills, are supported by all Socialists. For a further consideration of this point see chapter xv., "Objections to Socialism".

(*b*) SOCIALISM IS NOT THE REGIMENTATION OF SOCIETY.

Mr. Sidney Webb says: "It seems almost impossible to bring people to understand that the abstract word Socialism denotes, like radicalism, not an elaborate plan of society, but a principle of social action". He points out that Socialism inevitably suffers if identified with any particular scheme, or even with the best vision we can yet form of collectivism itself. People become so much concerned with details, he tells us, that they miss the principle. "They cannot see the forest for the trees." The moment will never come when we can say, "Now Socialism is established," for Socialism is not a status but a life. Society is not to be run into it as a mould. Socialism is evolutionary, though the evolution may be a gradual and peaceful revolution. This evolutionary character of Socialism is its marked modern aspect. Fifty years ago Socialism was utopian. Owen, St. Simon, Fourier, Cabet, all had their ideal Utopias into which they would have run society. Many of these Utopias were tried in various local communities in America. Some of these still exist, but are slowly dying. Commencing mainly with German Socialism, modern European

Socialism has, as a movement, outgrown this utopian stage. It was a necessary stage. All great ideas are born in Utopia. But movements, as well as men, outgrow cradles, and European Socialism is now evolutionary, though revolutionary, and is not utopian. In America Socialism, being a younger movement, has scarcely outgrown its utopian stage. Nationalism may be said to represent this utopian stage. *True Socialism is as flexible in its system, as it is definite in its aim.* Any system that would carry out its principle is Socialistic. This means that in different countries and under different conditions, Socialism would take very various forms. In Germany to-day it aims at a national development. In France it makes little of the nation, and centres around the commune, or township. In Belgium it comes very near to non-political co-operation, and yet is Socialism, not co-operation. In England it is parliamentary and municipal. In Switzerland it centres around the canton. In the United States it will probably follow the national instinct, and be a federation of industrial and political federations. Socialism, therefore, cannot be identified with any one form of Socialism. It is not Fourierism, nor Marxism, nor Bellamyism, nor the system of any reformer. Characteristic of modern Socialism is the name of Engels' latest book, *The Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science.* Says Prof. Ely (*Socialism and Social Reform*, p. 175): "Socialism is as strong as the strongest presentation which can be made of it. This must be clearly borne in mind by all students of the subject; for in the course of statement and re-statement Socialism will be made stronger than any presentation of it which has ever yet been given. No impartial person can deny this, any more than any such person can deny that it has become stronger in its programme as time has gone on, and this programme has been elaborated and improved."

(*c*) SOCIALISM IS NOT CO-OPERATION.

Co-operation in social science means the union of any group of persons, not using government as an instrument, for the purposes of joint purchase, production, distribution or consumption, on equitable principles and for their mutual benefit. Such groups may, and often do, compete with each other and with the world. They are composed of any persons, no matter where they live, who enter into the co-operation, and may represent a very small fraction of any community. Socialism is the union of the whole of any community for common ownership and management of land or capital; and while it may and often does favour the development of little groups or communes, it is the action of the whole of the community however small, and would not have the groups compete with each other. It would, too, very largely use the democratic State or municipality as an instrument to accomplish its ends, while co-operation *per se* would not. Co-operation springs from individuals who unite; Socialism from the natural or geographical unity of a whole community. Co-operation is usually for specific objects; Socialism would affect all industrial life. The distinction therefore is marked. Yet there is nothing contradictory between the two. Socialism is complete industrial co-operation. It has been called the Co-operative Commonwealth. Yet it does not follow that co-operation and Socialism differ simply in degree. There is a qualitative as well as a quantitative difference. They work in different ways—Socialism starting from the community; co-operation from individuals. Hence co-operation is not partial Socialism, or necessarily even a stepping stone towards Socialism. The two are simply not inconsistent. Any Socialist may be a co-operator and any co-operator a Socialist. As a matter of fact, however, most Socialists have objected to co-operation on the ground (1) that it does not recognise the fundamental position and starting point of Socialism, the natural and necessary unity of the whole community; (2) that it would not completely replace the present competitive system, and is therefore reactionary, in absorbing the attention of wage-workers upon gaining a few petty advantages, while blinding them to the great advantages to be gained by Socialism. This opposition, however, is now somewhat modified. The great success of co-operation, particularly in Great Britain and in Belgium, is convincing Socialists of the advantages and immediate benefits to be gained by co-operation, while the recent spread of Socialistic ideas and principles is teaching co-operators the futility of *mere* co-operation and the necessity of political and Socialistic action. In Belgium, especially, co-operation is being used to raise the funds to spread Socialism (see chapter viii.); while in England the two movements are more and more coming to aid each other, though remaining distinct.

(*d*) SOCIALISM IS NOT COMMUNISM.

Socialism and Communism are by some identified. The early Socialists, especially, used the two words synonymously, and by preference used the word Communism. Latterly, however, Communism is less used, and when used is more and more distinguished from Socialism. Socialism puts its emphasis on common *production and distribution*; Communism on *life* in common. Communism makes less of existing political institutions as instruments; Socialism would very largely use them. It is characteristic of the development that modern Socialism is undergoing that it talks less about Communism, though, perhaps, most Socialists hold Communism in their minds as an ultimate ideal. Says Mr. Kidd, speaking of modern Socialism (*Social Revolution*, p. 205): "The utopian projects which distinguished the writings of its earlier advocates have disappeared, and even the essential ideals of the movement tend to be kept in the background, to be discussed among the faithful as the ultimate goal, rather than with the adversary as the immediate end of endeavour. We have now not to deal with mere abstract and transcendental theories, but with a clearly defined movement in practical politics." Socialists are to a man evolutionists. They are coming more and more, therefore, to leave the future to the future. They ask not how life should be organised in the future, whether communal or not. What they ask is that society now own and conduct all industry. Some Socialists are Communists; some are not. Most Socialists would have all personal effects, clothing, furniture, books and pictures (to a moderate extent), heirlooms, etc., held as private belongings. They would have families and individuals live, either separately, or in common, exactly as they prefer. Socialism proposes the utmost freedom of personal choice in all ways of living. If Socialism produces Communism, it will be because individuals choose it; Socialism does not require any one mode of life.

(*e*) SOCIALISM IS NOT ANARCHISM.

Anarchism is of two schools—Individual Anarchism, sometimes called Philosophical Anarchism, or Anarchism Proper, and Anarchist Communism. In this section we consider the former alone. From it Socialism is utterly distinct. Anarchism bases itself upon a philosophy of Individual Sovereignty. Socialism, while believing that it will really ensure the freedom of the individual, vastly more than Anarchism, knows nothing of the philosophy of Individual Sovereignty. It holds this to be a mere philosophical figment of the imagination, having no basis in fact, —a dream, too, in which, as long as one lives, one can never find freedom in reality. As a matter of fact, say Socialists, man is born in society of one kind or another, and cannot escape from that fact; so that the sooner it is recognised the better. Socialism starts from the recognition of this fact, and by giving man the lordship over his social organisation would make him free. Anarchism vainly struggles to abolish the fact; and thus, aiming at a mirage, must always be nugatory.

Differing thus in their philosophy, Socialism and Anarchism differ even more in their methods. Socialists would largely use the State to gain freedom; Anarchists would abolish the State. Government Anarchists define as "the subjection of the non-invasive individual to an external will" (Tucker), the State as "the embodiment of the principle of invasion in an individual or band of individuals assuming to act as representatives or masters of the entire people within a given area".

These definitions Socialists cannot accept. States hitherto have been largely invasive, it is true; but it is a limping logic that declares that therefore they must always be so. Through all history, with exceptions which only prove the rule, States have been growing steadily less invasive, while they are, according to the Anarchists themselves, a mighty power. Which is the wiser, then, to take this mighty and steadily improving force and use it for the service of man, or to throw it away, because it has often been badly used? Natural philosophers could once have made out a stronger case as to the evil properties of electricity than Anarchists make out against the State. Do Anarchists to-day advise the disuse of electricity? No; the terror of man has now become his servant. So with the State. The State is the collective expression of the popular will. No king, no veriest tyrant ever ruled except by the will of the people. Because the popular will has been ignorant and evil, States have been evil. As the popular will grows less invasive under the workings of co-operative industry and freedom of life, so will the State grow less invasive. Socialism would use the State to further freedom; Anarchism would overthrow the State. Differing thus in their philosophy and in their methods, Anarchism and Socialism, it must be added, do not materially differ in their ultimate aims. Both seek the most absolute freedom for the individual. Many Anarchists would find this in voluntary co-operation; any man, however, unwilling to co-operate being left free to carry on industry by himself, if he can. Socialists would have society through the democratic State carry on industry in co-operative ways, and believe that it will be sure to be so advantageous to all that no one will desire to conduct private undertakings. Some Socialists are so sure of this that they would even allow anybody who desired to conduct private business to do so, convinced that he would soon fail; yet even these people are not Anarchists, because they believe in the State. They are voluntary Socialists. The ultimate aims of Anarchism and Socialism are thus not so far apart, though their ways of reaching them be utterly distinct. In Germany, in France, in England, in the United States, in all countries, Socialism is a political movement, obeying law, supporting government, respecting life. Anarchism in all countries despises politics, breaks law, plots against government, makes life unsafe. Socialism is peaceable, orderly, fraternal. Anarchism is a confessed self-seeking that knows no law.

(*f*) SOCIALISM IS NOT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

Anarchist Communism is the theory that "all things belong to all; and, provided that men and women contribute their share of labour for the production of necessary objects, they are entitled to their share of all that is produced by the community". This is to be realised not in the name of religion or of the State, "but in the name of the people" (Kropotkine). It claims to spring, like Philosophical Anarchism, from the doctrine of Individual Sovereignty, though the Philosophical Anarchists do not allow this claim; and it is hard to see how it can be substantiated, since if the individual be sovereign, why may he not own private property, if he can hold it, as the Philosophical Anarchists indeed consistently do allow, but which is contrary to the creed of Anarchist Communism? With these inconsistencies, however, we have not here to do. If Anarchist Communism does spring from the philosophy of Individual Sovereignty, Socialism differs from it fundamentally as from all Anarchism. In any case it wholly differs from its methods. Anarchist Communism, like all Anarchism, would overthrow the State. As a matter of fact, it is far more revolutionary in point of deed than Individual Anarchism. The Individual Anarchists have no scruples against using physical force; but they are wise enough to see that they are too few, at present at least, to use force successfully, and so they only resort to the dynamite of ideas. The Anarchist Communists, however, from the days of Bakunin to the present of Ravachol and Cesario Santo, and including Kropotkine and Reclus, quite as truly as Louise Michel and Vaillant, have glorified physical force, and magnified "the propaganda of the deed". Almost all the recent dynamiters and political assassins of Europe and America have been Anarchist Communists. Such methods Socialists utterly abhor. How near Socialism would come to Communism, how completely Socialists desire the freedom of the individual, we have seen ; but in the way of obtaining it, Socialism and Anarchism of all kinds are as different as light and darkness.

From the day when Karl Marx and Bakunin, after the Congress of the International at the Hague in 1872, led their forces into separate camps of Anarchists and Socialists, the two parties have never worked together. Says Prof. Ely (*Socialism and Social Reform*, p. 92) : " Everywhere Socialism fights Anarchy, and, on the other hand, is antagonised by it. Where the one is strong, the other, as already stated, is likely to languish. Social Democracy drove John Most out of Germany, and from early days has exerted itself most vigorously to keep down anything like an Anarchistic movement. The weakness of Anarchy in Germany is to be attributed more largely to the efforts of the Social Democracy than to any other force. Anarchists, when discovered, are regularly expelled from the conventions of the Social Democrats in Germany, and they were expelled from the International Socialistic Convention in Brussels in 1891, and again in Zurich in 1893."

CHAPTER III.

WHAT SOCIALISM IS.

SOCIALISM is that principle of society according to which the community as a whole, fraternally organised, should collectively own and co-operatively operate land and capital for the equitable good of all. It is as definite as a principle, as flexible in form. In different countries it is developing different forms. In Germany it aims at a national development. In France it centres around the commune; in Switzerland, around the canton. In Belgium it comes very near to non-political co-operation. In England it is parliamentary and municipal. In the United States it will probably develop the federated form. It is distinctly evolutionary. It holds that industrial life conforms to the laws of evolution as does any other portion of life; and that therefore no fixed formula can be laid down as of universal application, but that the system must be suited to the degree of development obtained by any people or civilisation. It holds that industry must go through (*a*) a period of primitive individualism when the natural resources of the earth are yet unmonopolised, and invention so little developed that capital and tools are scarcely needed, and each man is therefore comparatively free, though poor, ill-fed, ill-housed and ill-clad; (*b*) a period when, each living for self, the strong overcome the weak and compel the weak (women and slaves) to produce and toil for them in slavery, too often identical with the family; (*c*) a period when, law and order somewhat developing, and the poor somewhat voluntarily or involuntarily putting themselves under the protection of the powerful, a feudal system is developed, when the worker is abused, but often materially cared for and protected, though not free; (*d*) a period when, industry developing invention and machinery, society throws off all feudal restraints and brings back the old but now different individualism, an individualism endowed with all the advantages of science. At the close of this period and in the beginning of a new, Socialists say we now are. Individuals producing and struggling each for self, those who have inherited wealth or education, or ability or advantage of rank and circumstance, have been able to gain the ownership of the most valuable lands and of machinery, and have left the rest of mankind, deprived of land and machinery, to sustain existence only by working for the possessing classes (the wage system). Individual competition of manufacturers and employers compels them to produce as cheaply as possible in order to be able to sell as cheaply as possible. If they do not they must go out of business; for under free competition he who sells a given article the cheapest will get the trade. Therefore the manufacturer and producer, compelled to buy in the cheapest market, strive among other things to buy labour as cheaply as possible. The labourer, meanwhile, having no good land and no adequate capital, is compelled to sell his labour force at the best price he can. But since men multiply rapidly while land and capital are limited, and since machinery and invention constantly enable fewer and fewer men to do work formerly done by many, there soon comes to be competition of two (or two thousand) men to get the same job. Now, the employer we have seen to be compelled to employ those who will work cheapest. There thus comes to be a competition between workmen to see who will work cheapest, and so get the job. This goes on developing till wages fall to just that which will support and renew the lowest form of life, that will turn out the requisite grade of work. It is true that to an extent it pays to employ the higher grades of labour, because they turn out more and better work which will command more money; but this is more than counterbalanced, except in a small residuum of industry, by machinery and invention, which more and more enable unskilled labour, or at least labour very slightly skilled, to take the place of skilled labour. Women, usually partly supported by fathers, husbands, brothers, and more and more by lovers, can afford to work cheaper than men, and hence supplant men; boys supplant women, girls boys, ignorant races those more educated;—a process not theoretical, but which can be seen in the history of any factory town. The division of labour, marvellously increasing the product, more and more compels the worker to become a mere "hand," dependent on his machine, and knowing only one detail of one branch of one industry; so that when invention changes that detail he is left an unskilled worker. Competition, too, continually drives machinery at a faster and faster rate; so that while skilled American labourers, for example, get higher wages than those of any other country, they turn out a still greater relative product, and are sooner worn out and left to earn nothing. Organisations of labourers strive to prevent competition amongst themselves, and to unite against employers, who in their turn are compelled to unite, bringing on all the evils of strikes and a class war. Meanwhile, in spite of the trades unions, since they are able to organise only a comparatively few of the more skilled workmen, the competition of the unorganised either brings down wages or produces miseries which grow more rapidly than trades unionism can do good, causing industrial depression in spite of trades unionism. On the part of employers, too, combinations beget larger combinations. Leading firms unite. Monopoly sets in. Employers see that to combine is better than to compete. Railways, gas companies, various industries develop gigantic monopolies. Wealth is concentrated in the hands of the few. This means a decreased demand for ordinary products; since the masses, though needy, have no money with which to buy. Demand is reduced, even while the people are starving. Crises grow more and more frequent. Great wealth and great possibilities of gain for the few develop a love for speculation and luxury. The wealthy are educated and cultured; they have time for art and religion. They are often charitable and generous. The workers meanwhile, compelled to work and strain harder and harder under the competition to live, grow materialistic and reckless. The rich come to appear to deserve their wealth. But inherited wealth develops fast living; and inherited poverty, hopelessness, recklessness, and thriftlessness. In a word, we have the modern world. This, say Socialists, is what has happened and must happen as long as industrial competition reigns.

Profit sharing, trades unions, partial co-operation, model tenements, charities, may do a little temporary good, but are mere bubbles on the ocean of competition ; the only way is to slowly replace competition by universal co-operation, which is Socialism. A mere land reform, by the Single Tax, or by any other method, would do some good ; but since land and capital are *both* necessary to production, the monopolisation of machinery would soon enable the monopolisers to control the many, thus making permanent relief impossible till both were socialised. The present cannot endure. Competition is at an end. Combination of some kind we must have. It is not a question of competition or combination ; but, of what kind of combination we shall have—the combination of the few or of the many. Such is the essence of the Socialistic contention.

Outside of this there is endless variety of view. Some Socialists would allow some private property, others would not ; some would socialise land and capital through the nation, others through the State, still others through the commune ; but on the above analysis all Socialists are substantially agreed. Given this, they hold that all else will come—education, art, science, universal progress. To accomplish this freedom through political organisation is the next task, say the Socialists, before humanity, the evolution of a true social organism out of the contending human organisms. Socialism, then, is the replacing of industrial competition by universal industrial co-operation. It would have the community as a whole own all land and capital, and operate them for the common good. It would have this done by the community *as a whole*, not through any section of the community. True Socialists, therefore, do not believe that small groups of co-operating workers, who may chance to bind themselves together, should own capital and conduct it co-operatively. That is co-operation, not Socialism (see chap. ii., § *c*). True Socialists do not believe in trades unions owning and conducting the plant in their respective trades; they do not believe in communistic colonies or in brotherhood trusts, of any group of individuals who may choose to unite. These steps may possibly be wise as makeshifts or transition measures, but they are not Socialism. Socialism is not the coming together of individuals at all, but the recognition of the natural unity of the *whole* community and the conduct of industry from this basis. Hence, in democratic countries, Socialism largely uses the government, which is the organised unity of the community. Through such government it would more and more own land and capital and conduct industry. The government, however, must be distinctly *democratic*. Socialism we have seen to be (chap. ii., § *a*) distinctly fraternal. It *opposes* all despotic or paternal governmentalism. It strives steadily to decentralise government and render it more democratic. It would do away with rulers, and introduce self-government through the Referendum and the Initiative. It is democracy in industry. Nor would Socialism limit *all* competition. Competition is not its devil. It recognises good as well as evil in competition. It would simply abolish *industrial* competition. It believes in the evolution of competition. Competition was once mainly physical; this produced the survival of the fittest to survive in *physical strife*. "There were giants in those days," the Nimrods, the Goliaths, the Agamemnons, "kings of men". Organised society gradually restrained that physical strife, and competition became chiefly military between states. This was the distinguishing feature of the Greek state and of the Roman civilisation. It produced an Alexander, a Hannibal, a Cæsar, and continued to the time of Napoleon, and is not yet dead. But gradually advancing fraternalism has replaced military by industrial competition. To-day men strive neither with guns nor with poisoned arrows, so much as with cornerings of the market and with poisoned groceries. It has produced the survival of the fittest to survive in such a strife,—the Rothschilds, the Jay Goulds, the Vanderbilts, the Pullmans, the Napoleons of finance. Therefore, Socialists do not urge the abolition of competition. They simply say that it is time to lift competition to a higher level, and make it intellectual not industrial. As organised fraternalism has to a large measure put down physical strife, and is putting down militarism, so Socialists would have it gradually supplant industrial competition by industrial co-operation. When men by co-operating for a few hours a day, during the main portion of life, in working for the common good, are ensured an existence and relieved from industrial competition, they will begin to compete for honour in art, in science and in literature. This will produce the survival of those most fitted to survive in such strife,—kings of art, of literature, of science. At different times in the world's history, notably in Athens, in Rome of the Augustan age, more or less continually in England, France, Germany and Italy, certain *classes* have been largely relieved from industrial competition, and intellectual competition has produced intellectual giants, the competition enlisting even some not belonging to those classes; but the amount of talent has been largely proportional to the extent to which some portion of the community have been relieved from the daily struggle for bread. Now Socialists would lift all society above that sordid struggle. Socialists thus do not deny a large measure of truth in the Darwinian theory of the necessity of competition to progress, though most Socialists do deny that this is the only source of progress. Socialists even plant themselves on the Darwinian theory, and believe in the evolution of competition, the survival of that form of competition most fitted to survive. Competition, first physical, then military, then industrial, they would now have intellectual, while they press on to the final competition taught by the First Great Socialist, when He said to His followers: "If any man will be chief among you let him be servant of all". Socialists thus believe not in the repression of the individual, but in his development. They seek not slavery but freedom, and they believe that fraternal (not military) order is the mother of freedom. As the largely individualistic French Revolution sought Liberty, Equality, Fraternity (in that order), and even in successful revolution failed to reach liberty, the Socialistic evolution would reverse the order and aim first at Fraternity, then at Equality, and so

Liberty. They urge that Socialism will mean the very "Open Sesame" to woman and man, of true individuality, giving us a twentieth-century renaissance in art, a revival of learning, a reformation in religion.

Socialism seeks no break with the past, no sudden revolution; but a deeper and more revolutionary, although steady and gradual, pressing towards the future on the lines of social evolution, from lower organisms, evolving higher unities and lifting the struggle for existence to higher and higher planes.

Socialism, thus based on evolution, we are not surprised to find not based on any one system of political economy. Marxian Socialism has been technically called "Scientific Socialism," but to-day by no means all scientific Socialists accept its analysis. Many of them, particularly in England, reject Marxian economics, even in the same breath that they acknowledge the service rendered to mankind by Marx, and even while they enthusiastically support the Marxian Socialist policy. Marx was not the founder of a new economic system. He simply took the economic basis he inherited from Adam Smith and Ricardo, and carried it out with wide learning, masterly analysis, and acutest logic into Socialism. But it may be carried still further to Anarchism. If labour is the source of value, Anarchism is logical, though impracticable. But the trouble was with what Marx inherited. Most political economists to-day and a growing number of Socialists reject his inherited fundamental basis that labour is the source and measure of (exchange) value. They are coming to hold rather with Jevons, that utility, rightly conceived, is the source of (exchange) value. Rejecting the basis, they therefore reject the Marxian analysis and come to his result from another standpoint. All modern production they declare to be a social process, to which land, capital and labour must *all* contribute. If any persons monopolise any one of those elements, all other persons are necessarily at their service. Therefore they would have society, as a whole, own both land and capital and perform labour. "Nine hundred and ninety-nine parts out of the thousand of every man's produce are the result of his social inheritance and environment;" so says Edward Bellamy (*Contemporary Review*, July, 1890); and Mr. Kidd adds: "This is so; and it is, if possible, even more true of the work of our brain than of the work of our hands" (*Social Evolution*, p. 267). All attempt, therefore, to divide produce according to individual contribution to the result, must be impossible. Labour does not measure value. A bushel of grain carefully and laboriously raised on a desert island sells for no more than a bushel of grain raised in Kent or in Kansas. Utility, rightly understood, is the measure of value. Socialism would divide therefore this product measured by its social value equally among the workers, the problem of getting the best man into the places of organising responsibility and trust being met not by offering higher pay, but by giving them (a far more effectual motive) higher honour, the necessary means of existence being secured to all. This is the view to-day of a growing number of Socialists. Socialism is, however, not committed to this or to any other one economic analysis. Critics tilt against Karl Marx, or Edward Bellamy, or some Fabian; and perhaps, making their point, think they have demolished Socialism. Expecting it to collapse they are surprised to find it rising stronger, purer, more omnipotent than ever. No school of thought ever gained more from its defeats than has Socialism. This is because its basis is deep in social evolution itself, not in any man's or in any school's attempt to analyse and explain that evolution. Karl Marx's great merit will more and more in coming years be seen not to have outlined a system of scientific Socialism, but to have been among the first to see that Socialism was evolutionary, and with resistless energy and commanding will to have organised the Socialist *movement*, clearing it alike from the revolutionary emptiness of Anarchism, and the reactionary feebleness of *mere* co-operation, trades unionism and State paternalism.

As to how Socialists would apply their principles, the answer, we have seen, must vary with the degree of democratic and industrial progress, and the form of civilisation attained in any country. For details we therefore refer the reader to the chapters on the various countries (chapters v.-xii.). But in general we may say that the Socialist programme in all countries is to press for an ever-increasing amount of Socialistic legislation, and still more for an ever-widening spread of Socialistic thought, till finally the majority in each nation, becoming converted to Socialism, shall seize the reins of a government already far along in the Socialist path, and, with as little sudden change as possible, institute the complete socialisation of industry. From such a conception of Socialism it follows that Socialists to-day spend little time in dreaming of the future. To the future the future may be left. Content with a firm grasp on their central principle and willing to sacrifice this for no reactionary policy, or side promises however alluring of communistic colonies and co-operative efforts, Socialists are learning more and more to concentrate their efforts on the present political battle, and to leave the details of the future to the decision of circumstances. Says Mr. Kidd, speaking of this policy (*Social Evolution*, p. 206): "We have not now to deal with mere abstract and transcendental theories, but with a clearly defined movement in practical politics, appealing to some of the deepest instincts of a large proportion of the voting population, and professing to provide a programme likely in the future to stand more and more on its own merits in opposition to all other programmes whatever". Alike in England, Germany and France, has Socialism lost its utopian character. Even in the United States, where Socialism is a much more recent development, the utopian stage represented by the Nationalist movement, under the influence of Mr. Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, is already giving place to evolutionary Socialism, in which indeed all the Nationalists themselves believe. Nevertheless, Utopias have their place. The indebtedness of Socialism to More's *Utopia*, to Cabet's *Voyage en Icarie*, to Bellamy's *Looking Backward* and to Morris's *News from Nowhere*, it were difficult to over-estimate. If Utopias be not taken for photographs, and if Socialism be not limited to any man's dream of it, such idealisations, in quickening thought and rousing the interest of the sluggish and unimaginative, are of the greatest use. We therefore close this chapter, always with the above warning, by quoting one of the best short ideals of

Socialism yet written, that by Mrs. Annie Besant, published in the *Fabian Essays*:—

> Let us suppose, then, that the evolution of the capitalist system has proceeded but a little further along the present lines, concentrating the control of industry, and increasingly substituting labour-saving machinery for human beings. It is being accompanied, and must continue to be accompanied, by a growth of the numbers of the unemployed. These numbers may ebb and flow, as some of the waves of a rising tide run forward some feet and then a few touch a lower level; but as the tide rises despite the fluctuations of the ripples, so the numbers of the unemployed will increase despite transient mountings and fallings. With these, probably, will begin the tentative organisation of industry by the State; but this organisation will soon be followed by the taking over by the community of some of the great Trusts.
>
> The division of the country into clearly defined areas, each with its elected authority, is essential to any effective scheme of organisation. It is one of the symptoms of the coming change, that, in perfect unconsciousness of the nature of his act, Mr. Ritchie has established the Commune. He has divided England into districts ruled by County Councils, and has thus created the machinery without which Socialism was impracticable. True, he has only made an outline which needs to be filled in; but Socialists can fill in, whereas they had no power to outline. It remains to give every adult a vote in the election of councillors; to shorten their term of office to a year; to pay the councillors, so that the public may have a right to the whole of their working time; to give the councils power to take and hold land—a reform already asked for by the Liberal and Radical Union, a body not consciously Socialist; and to remove all legal restrictions, so as to leave them as free to act corporately as an individual is to act individually. These measures accomplished, the rapidity with which our institutions are socialised depends on the growth of Socialism among the people. It is essential to the stability of the changed forms of industry that they shall be made by the people, not imposed upon them; hence the value of Mr. Ritchie's gift of local government, enabling each locality to move swiftly or slowly, to experiment on a comparatively small scale, even to blunder without widespread disaster. The *mot d'ordre* for Socialists now is: "Convert the electors; and capture the County Councils". These councils, administering local affairs, with the national Executive, administering national affairs, are all destined to be turned into effective industrial organisers; and the unit of administration must depend on the nature of the industry. The post, the telegraph, the railways, the canals, and the great industries capable of being organised into Trusts, will, so far as we can see now, be best administered each from a

single centre for the whole kingdom. Tramways, gas-works, water-works, and many of the smaller productive industries, will be best managed locally. In marking the lines of division, convenience and experience must be our guides. The demarcations are of expediency, not of principle.

The first great problem that will press on the County Council for solution will be that of the unemployed. Wisely or unwisely, it will have to deal with them: wisely, if it organises them for productive industry; unwisely, if it opens "relief works," and tries, like an enlarged Bumble, to shirk the difficulty by enforcing barren and oppressive toil upon outlawed wretches at the expense of the rest of the community. Many of the unemployed are unskilled labourers: a minority are skilled. They must first be registered as skilled and unskilled, and the former enrolled under their several trades. Then can begin the rural organisation of labour on county farms held by the County Councils. The council will have its Agricultural Committee, charged with the administrative details; and this committee will choose well-trained, practical agriculturists as directors of the farm business. To the county farm will be drafted from the unemployed in the towns the agricultural labourers who have wandered townwards in search of work, and many of the unskilled labourers. On these farms every advantage of machinery and every discovery in agricultural science should be utilised to the utmost. The crops should be carefully chosen with reference to soil and aspect—cereals, fruit, vegetables—and the culture adapted to the crop, the one aim being to obtain the largest amount of produce with the least expenditure of human labour. Whether land is most profitably cultivated in large or small parcels depends on the crop; and in the great area of the county farm, *la grande et la petite culture* might each have its place. Economy would also gain by the large number of labourers under the direction of the head farmer, since they could be concentrated when required at any given spot, as in harvest time, and dispersed to work at the more continuous kinds of tillage when the seasonal task was over.

To these farms must also be sent some skilled labourers from among the unemployed—shoemakers, tailors, smiths, carpenters, etc.; so that the county farm may be self-supporting as far as it can be without waste of productive power. All the small industries necessary in daily life should be carried on in it, and an industrial commune thus built up. The democracy might be trusted to ordain that an eight hours' day, and a comfortable home, should be part of the life-conditions on the county farm. Probably each large farm would soon have its central store, with its adjacent railway station, in addition to the ordinary farm buildings; its public hall in the centre of the farm village to be used for lectures, concerts, and entertainments of all sorts; its public schools, elementary and technical;

and soon, possibly from the outset, its public meal-room, saving time and trouble to housewives, and, while economising fuel and food, giving a far greater choice and variety of dishes. Large dwellings, with suites of rooms, might perhaps replace old-fashioned cottages; for it is worth noting, as showing the tendency already existing among ourselves to turn from isolated self-dependence to the advantages of associated living, that many modern flats are being built without servants' rooms, the house-cleaning, etc., being done by persons engaged for the whole block, and the important meals being taken at restaurants, so as to avoid the trouble and expense of private cooking. It will surely be well in initiating new organisations of industry to start on the most advanced lines, and take advantage of every modern tendency towards less isolated modes of living. Socialists must work hard to make municipal dealings with the unemployed avenues to the higher life, not grudging utilisation of pauper labour. And as they know their aim, and the other political parties live but from hand to mouth, they ought to be able to exercise a steady and uniform pressure, which, just because it is steady and uniform, will impress its direction on the general movement.

The note of urban industrial organisation, as of all other, must be that each person shall be employed to do what he can do best, not what he does worst. It may be desirable for a man to have two trades; but watchmaking and stone-breaking are not convenient alternative occupations. Where the skilled unemployed belong to trades carried on everywhere, such as baking, shoemaking, tailoring, etc., they should be employed at their own trades in municipal workshops, and their products garnered in municipal stores. These workshops will be under the direction of foremen, thoroughly skilled workmen, able to superintend and direct as though in private employment. The working day must be of eight hours, and the wages, for the present, the Trades Union minimum. Then, instead of tailors and shoemakers tramping the streets ragged and barefoot, the tailors will be making clothes and the shoemakers boots and shoes; and the shoemaker with the wages he earns will buy the tailor's products, and the tailor the shoemaker's. Then, instead of supporting the unemployed by rates levied on the employed, they will be set to work to supply their own necessities, and be producers of the wealth they consume, instead of consuming, in enforced idleness or barren penal exercises in the stone-yard, the wealth produced by others. Masons, bricklayers, plumbers, carpenters, etc., might be set to work in building decent and pleasant dwellings—in the style of the blocks of flats, not of the barracks called model dwellings—for the housing of the municipal industrial army. I lay stress on the pleasantness of the dwellings. These places are to be dwellings for citizens, not prisons for paupers; and there is no possible reason why they should not be made attractive. Under Socialism the workers are to be the nation, and all that is best is for their service; for, be it remembered, our faces are set towards Socialism, and our organisation of labour is to be on Socialist lines.

It is very likely that among the unemployed some will be found whose trade can only be carried on by large numbers, and is not one of the industries of the town into which their unlucky fate has drifted them. These should be sent into municipal service in the towns where their trade is the staple industry, there to be employed in the municipal factory.

Concurrently with this rural and urban organisation of non-centralised industries will proceed the taking over of the great centralised industries, centralised for us by capitalists, who thus unconsciously pave the way for their own supersession. Everything which has been organised into a Trust, and has been worked for a time in the Trust fashion, is ripe for appropriation by the community. All minerals would be most properly worked in this centralised way; and it will probably be found most convenient to work all the big productive industries—such as the textile—in similar fashion. It is idle to say that it cannot be done by the State when it is being done by a ring of capitalists: a Local Board, an Iron Board, a Tin Board, can be as easily responsible to the nation as to a casual crowd of shareholders. There need be no dislocation of production in making the transference: the active organisers and directors of a Trust do not necessarily, or even usually, own the capital invested in it. If the State finds it convenient to hire these organisers and directors, there is nothing to prevent its doing so for as long or as short a period as it chooses. The temporary arrangements made with them during the transition period must be governed by expediency.

Let us pause for a moment to estimate the position so far. The unemployed have been transformed into communal workers—in the country on great farms, improvements of the Bonanza farms in America—in the towns in various trades. Public stores for agricultural and industrial products are open in all convenient places, and filled with the goods thus communally produced. The great industries, worked as Trusts, are controlled by the State instead of by capitalist rings. The private capitalist, however, will still be in business, producing and distributing on his own account in competition with the communal organisations, which at present will have occupied only part of the industrial field. But apart from a pressure which will be recognised when we come to deal with the remuneration of labour, these private enterprises will be carried on under circumstances of ever-increasing difficulty. In face of the orderly communal arrays, playing into each other's hands, with the credit of the country behind them, the ventures of the private capitalist will be at as great a disadvantage as the cottage industries of the last century in face of the factory industries of our own period. The Trusts have taught us how to drive competing capitals out of the market by associated capitals. The Central Boards or County Councils will be able to utilise this power of association further than any private capitalists. Thus the economic forces which replaced the workshop by the factory, will replace the private shop by the municipal store and the private factory by the municipal one. And the advantages of greater concentration of capital and of association of labour will not be the only ones enjoyed by the communal workers. All waste will be checked, every labour-saving appliance utilised to the utmost, where the object is the production of general wealth and not the production of profit to be appropriated by a class; for in the one case it is the interest of the producers to produce—inasmuch as their enjoyment depends on the productivity of their labour—whereas in the other it is their interest to sterilise their labour as far as they dare, in order to render more of it necessary and so keep up its price. As the organisation of the public industry extends, and supplants more and more the individualist producer, the probable demand will be more easily estimated, and the supply regulated to meet it. The Municipalities and Central Boards will take the place of the competing small capitalists and the rings of large ones; and production will become ordered and rational instead of anarchical and reckless as it is to-day. After a while the private producers will disappear, not because there will be any law against individualist production, but because it will not pay. No one will care to face the worries, the harassments, the anxieties, of individuals struggling for livelihood, when ease, freedom, and security can be enjoyed in the communal service.

The best form of management during the transition period, and possibly for a long time to come, will be through the Communal Councils, which will appoint committees to superintend the various branches of industry. These committees will engage the necessary manager and foreman for each shop, factory, etc., and will hold the power of dismissal as of appointment. I do not believe that the direct election of the manager and foreman by the employees would be found to work well in practice, or to be consistent with the discipline necessary in carrying on any large business undertaking. It seems to me better that the commune should elect its council—thus keeping under its own control the general authority—but should empower the council to select the officials, so that the power of selection and dismissal within the various sub-divisions should lie with the nominees of the whole commune instead of with the particular group immediately concerned.

There is no practical difficulty in the way of the management of the ordinary productive industries, large or small. The Trusts and co-operation have, between them, solved, or put us in the way of solving, all problems connected with these. But there are difficulties in connection with the industries concerned in the production of such commodities as books and newspapers. During the transitional stage these difficulties will not arise ; but when all industries are carried on by the commune, or the nation, how will books and newspapers be produced ? I only throw out the following suggestions. Printing, like baking, tailoring, shoemaking, is a communal rather than a national industry. Suppose we had printing offices controlled by the Communal Council. The Printing Committee might be left free to accept any publication it thought valuable, as a private firm to-day may take the risk of publication, the arrangement with the author being purchase outright, or royalty on copies sold, in each case so much to be put to his credit at the Communal Bank. But there are many authors whose goods are desired by no one : it would be absurd to force the community to publish all minor poetry. Why not accept the principle that in every case where the Printing Committee declines to print at the communal risk, the author may have his work printed by transferring from his credit at the Communal Bank to the account of the Printing Committee sufficient to cover the cost of printing? The committee should have no power to refuse to print, where the cost was covered. Thus liberty of expression would be guarded as a constitutional right, while the community would not be charged with the cost of printing every stupid effusion that its fond composer might deem worthy of publicity.

Newspapers might be issued on similar terms ; and it would always be open to individuals, or to groups of individuals, to publish anything they pleased on covering the cost of publication. With the comparative affluence which would be enjoyed by each member of the community, any one who really cared to reach the public ear would be able to do so by diminishing his expenditure in other directions.

Another difficulty which will meet us, although not immediately, is the competition for employment in certain pleasanter branches of industry. At present an unemployed person would catch eagerly at the chance of any well-paid work he was able to perform. If he were able both to set type and to stitch coats, he would not dream of grumbling if he were by chance offered the job he liked the less of the two : he would be only too glad to get either. But it is quite possible that as the vast amelioration of life-conditions proceeds, Jeshurun will wax fat and kick if, when he prefers to make microscope lenses, he is desired to make mirrors. Under these circumstances, Jeshurun will, I fear, have to accommodate himself to the demand. If the number of people engaged in making lenses suffices to meet the demand for lenses, Jeshurun must consent to turn his talents for the time to mirror-making. After all, his state will not be very pitiable, though Socialism will have failed, it is true, to make 2 + 2 = 5.

This, however, hardly solves the general question as to the apportioning of labourers to the various forms of labour. But a solution has been found by the ingenious author of *Looking Backward*, from A.D. 2000.

Leaving young men and women free to choose their employments, he would equalise the rates of volunteering by equalising the attractions of the trades. In many cases natural bent, left free to develop itself during a lengthened educational term, will determine the choice of avocation. Human beings are fortunately very varied in their capacities and tastes: that which attracts one repels another. But there are unpleasant and indispensable forms of labour which, one would imagine, can attract none—mining, sewer-cleaning, etc. These might be rendered attractive by making the hours of labour in them much shorter than the normal working day of pleasanter occupations. Many a strong, vigorous man would greatly prefer a short spell of disagreeable work to a long one at a desk. As it is well to leave the greatest possible freedom to the individual, this equalising of advantages in all trades would be far better than any attempt to perform the impossible task of choosing an employment for each. A person would be sure to hate any work into which he was directly forced, even though it were the very one he would have chosen had he been left to himself.

Further, much of the most disagreeable and laborious work might be done by machinery, as it would be now if it were not cheaper to exploit a helot class. When it became illegal to send small boys up chimneys, chimneys did not cease to be swept: a machine was invented for sweeping them. Coal-cutting might now be done by machinery, instead of by a man lying on his back, picking away over his head at the imminent risk of his own life; but the machine is much dearer than men, so the miners continue to have their chests crushed in by the falling coal. Under Socialism, men's lives and limbs will be more valuable than machinery; and science will be tasked to substitute the one for the other.

In truth the extension of machinery is very likely to solve many of the problems connected with differential advantages in employment; and it seems certain that, in the very near future, the skilled worker will not be the man who is able to perform a particular set of operations, but the man who has been trained in the use of machinery. The difference of trade will be in the machine rather than in the man: whether the produce is nails or screws, boots or coats, cloth or silk, paper-folding or type-setting, will depend on the internal arrangements of the mechanism and not on the method of applying the force. What we shall probably do will be to instruct all our youth in the principles of mechanics and in the handling of machines; the machines will be constructed so as to turn the force into the various channels required to produce the various articles; and the skilled workman will be the skilled *mechanic*, not the skilled printer or bootmaker. At the present time a few hours' or a few days' study will make the trained mechanician master of any machine you can place before him. The line of progress is to substitute machines for men in every department of production: let the brain plan, guide, control; but let iron and steel, steam and electricity, that do not tire and cannot be brutalised, do the whole of the heavy toil that exhausts human frames to-day. There is not the slightest reason to suppose that we are at the end of an inventive era. Rather are we only just beginning to grope after the uses of electricity; and machinery has before it possibilities almost undreamed of now, the men produced by our system being too rough-handed for the manipulation of delicate and complicated contrivances. I suggest this only as a probable simplification of balancing the supply and demand in various forms of labour in the future: our immediate method of regulation must be the equalising of advantages in them.

One may guess that in each nation all the Boards and communal authorities will ultimately be represented in some central Executive, or Industrial Ministry; that the Minister of Agriculture, of Mineral Industries, of Textile Industries, and so on, will have relations with similar officers in other lands; and that thus, internationally as well as nationally, co-operation will replace competition. But that end is not yet.

We now approach a yet more thorny subject than the organisation of the workers. What should be the remuneration of labour—what the share of the product taken respectively by the individual, the municipality, and the State?

The answer depends on the answer to a previous question. Is the organisation of the unemployed to be undertaken in order to transform them into self-supporting, self-respecting citizens; or is it to be carried on as a form of exploitation, utilising pauper labour for the production of profit for non-paupers? The whole matter turns on this point; and unless we know our own minds, and fight for the right method and against the wrong from the very beginning, the organisation of the unemployed will be a buttress for the present system instead of a step towards a better. Already there is talk of establishing labour colonies in connection with workhouses; and there is no time to be lost if we are to take advantage of the good in the proposal and exclude the bad. The County Councils also will lead to an increase of municipal employment; and the method of that employment is vital.

The ordinary vestryman, driven by the force of circumstances into organising the unemployed, will try to extract a profit to the ratepayers from pauper farms by paying the lowest rates of wages. He would find this way of proceeding very congenial, and would soon, if permitted, simply municipalise slave-driving. In this way the municipal and rural organisation of labour, even when its necessity and its advantages are realised, can do nothing but change the form of exploitation of labour if the workers in public employ are to be paid a wage fixed by the competition of the market, and the profits of their labour used only for the relief of the rates. Under such circumstances we should have the whole of the rates paid by the communal workers, while the private employers would go free. This would not be a transition to Socialism, but only a new way of creating a class of municipal serfs, which would make our towns burlesques of the ancient Greek slaveholding "democracies". We shall find surer ground by recalling and applying the principle of Socialism that the labourers shall enjoy the full product of their toil. It seems to me that this might be worked out somewhat in the following way:—

Out of the value of the communal produce must come rent of land payable to the local authority, rent of plant needed for working the industries, wages advanced and fixed in the usual way, taxes, reserve fund, accumulation fund, and the other charges necessary for the carrying on of the communal business. All these deducted, the remaining value should be divided among the communal workers as a "bonus". It would be obviously inconvenient, if not impossible, for the district authority to subdivide this value and allot so much to each of its separate undertakings—so much left over from gas works for the men employed there, so much from the tramways for the men employed on them, and so on. It would be far simpler and easier for the municipal employees to be regarded as a single body, in the service of a single employer, the local authority; and that the surplus from the whole of the businesses carried on by the Communal Council should be divided without distinction among the whole of the communal employees. Controversy will probably arise as to the division: shall all the shares be equal; or shall the workers receive in proportion to the supposed dignity or indignity of their work? Inequality, however, would be odious; and I have already suggested a means of adjusting different kinds of labour to a system of equal division of net product. This meets the difficulty of the varying degrees of irksomeness without invidiously setting up any kind of socially useful labour as more honourable than any other—a distinction essentially unsocial and pernicious. But since in public affairs ethics are apt to go to the wall, and appeals to social justice too often fall on deaf ears, it is lucky that in this case ethics and convenience coincide. The impossibility of estimating the separate value of each man's labour with any really valid result, the friction which would arise, the jealousies which would be provoked, the inevitable discontent, favouritism and jobbery that would prevail: all these things will drive the Communal Council into the right path, equal remuneration of all workers. That path once entered on, the principle of simplification will spread; and presently it will probably be found convenient that all the Communal Councils shall send in their reports to a Central Board, stating the number of their employees, the amount of the values produced, the deductions for rent and other charges, and their available surplus. All these surpluses added together would then be divided by the total number of communal employees, and the sum thus reached would be the share of each worker. The national trusts would at first be worked separately on lines analogous to those sketched for the communes ; but later these would be lumped in with the rest, and still further equalise the reward of labour. As private enterprises dwindle, more and more of the workers will pass into communal employ, until at last the Socialist ideal is touched of a nation in which all adults are workers, and all share the national product. But be it noted that all this grows out of the first organisation of industry by Municipalities and County Councils, and will evolve just as fast or just as slowly as the community and its sections choose. The values dealt with, and the numbers employed at first, would not imply as much complexity of detail as is involved in many of the great businesses now carried on by individuals and by companies. The same brains will be available for the work as are now hired by individuals ; and it is rather the novelty of the idea than the difficulty of its realisation which will stand in the way of its acceptance.

It is probable, however, that for some time to come the captains of industry will be more highly paid than the rank and file of the industrial army, not because it is just that they should receive higher remuneration, but because they, having still the alternative of private enterprise, will be able to demand their ordinary terms, at which it will pay the community better to engage them than to do without them—which would be indeed impossible. But their remuneration will fall as education spreads : their present value is a scarcity value, largely dependent on their monopoly of the higher education ; and as the wider training is thrown open to all, an ever-increasing number will become qualified to act as organisers and directors.

The form in which the worker's share is paid to him is not a matter of primary importance. It would probably be convenient to have Communal Banks, issuing cheques like those of the Cheque Bank ; and these banks could open credits to the workers to the amount of their remuneration. The way in which each worker expended his wealth would of course be his own business.

The above method of dealing with the surplus remaining from communal labour, after rent and other charges had been paid to the Municipality, would prove the most potent factor in the supersession of private enterprises. The amounts produced by the communal organisations would exceed those produced under individualist control ; but even if this were not so, yet the shares of the communal workers, as they would include the produce now consumed by idlers, would be higher than any wage which could be paid by the private employer. Hence competition to enter the communal service, and a constant pressure on the Communal Councils to enlarge their undertakings.

It should be added that children and workers incapacitated by age or sickness should receive an equal share with the communal employees. As all have been children, are at times sick, and hope to live to old age, all in turn would share the advantage; and it is only just that those who have laboured honestly in health and through maturity should enjoy the reward of labour in sickness and through old age.

The share of individuals and of Municipalities being thus apportioned, there remains only a word to say as to the Central National Council—the "State" *par excellence.* This would derive the revenues necessary for the discharge of its functions from contributions levied on the Communal Councils. It is evident that in the adjustment of these contributions could be effected the "nationalisation" of any special natural resources, such as mines, harbours, etc., enjoyed by exceptionally well situated communes. The levy would be, in fact, of the nature of an income-tax.

Such a plan of distribution—especially that part of it which equalises the shares in the product—is likely to provoke the question: "What will be the stimulus to labour under the proposed system? Will not the idle evade their fair share of labour, and live in clover on the industry of their neighbour?"

The general stimulus to labour will be, in the first place, then as now, the starvation which would follow the cessation of labour. Until we discover the country in which jam-rolls grow on bushes, and roasted sucking-pigs run about crying "Come eat me!" we are under an imperious necessity to produce. We shall work because, on the whole, we prefer work to starvation. In the transition to Socialism, when the organisation of labour by the Communal Councils begins, the performance of work will be the condition of employment; and as non-employment will mean starvation—for when work is offered, no relief of any kind need be given to the healthy adult who refuses to perform it—the strongest possible stimulus will force men to work. In fact, "work or starve" will be the alternative set before each communal employee; and as men now prefer long-continued and ill-paid work to starvation, they will certainly, unless human nature be entirely changed, prefer short and well-paid work to starvation. The individual shirker will be dealt with much as he is to-day: he will be warned, and, if he prove incorrigibly idle, discharged from the communal employ. The vast majority of men now seek to retain their employment by a reasonable discharge of their duty: why should they not do the same when the employment is on easier conditions? At first, discharge would mean being flung back into the whirlpool of competition, a fate not likely to be challenged. Later, as the private enterprises succumbed to the competition of the commune, it would mean almost hopelessness of obtaining a livelihood. When social reorganisation is complete, it would mean absolute starvation. And as the starvation would be deliberately incurred and voluntarily undergone, it would meet with no sympathy and no relief.

The next stimulus would be the appetite of the worker for the result of the communal toil, and the determination of his fellow-workers to make him take his fair share of the work of producing it. It is found at the present time that a very small share of the profits arising from associated labour acts as a tremendous stimulus to each individual producer. Firms which allot a part of their profits for division among their employees find the plan profitable to themselves. The men work eagerly to increase the common product, knowing that each will have a larger bonus as the common product is larger: they become vigilant as to waste in production; they take care of the machinery; they save gas, etc. In a word, they lessen the cost as much as they can, because each saving means gain to them. We see from the experiments of Leclaire and Godin that inventiveness also is stimulated by a share in the common produce. The workers in these businesses are ever trying to discover better methods to improve their machinery, in a word to progress, since each step forward brings improvement of their lot. Inventions come from a desire to save trouble, as well as from the impulse of inventive genius, the joy in accomplishing an intellectual triumph, and the delight of serving the race. Small inventions are continually being made by clever workmen to facilitate their operations, even when they are not themselves personally gainers by them ; and there is no reason to fear that this spontaneous exercise of inventiveness will cease when the added productivity of labour lightens the task or increases the harvest of the labourer. Is it to be argued that men will be industrious, careful, and inventive when they get only a fraction of the result of their associated labour, but will plunge into sloth, recklessness, and stagnation when they get the whole ? that a little gain stimulates, but any gain short of complete satisfaction would paralyse ? If there is one vice more certain than another to be unpopular in a Socialist community, it is laziness. The man who shirked would find his mates making his position intolerable, even before he suffered the doom of expulsion.

But while these compelling motives will be potent in their action on man as he now is, there are others, already acting on some men, which will one day act on all men. Human beings are not the simple and one-sided organisms they appear to the superficial glance of the individualist—moved only by a single motive, the desire for pecuniary gain—by one longing, the longing for wealth. Under our present social system, the struggle for riches assumes an abnormal and artificial development : riches mean nearly all that makes life worth having—security against starvation, gratification of taste, enjoyment of pleasant and cultured society, superiority to many temptations, self-respect, consideration, comfort, knowledge, freedom, as far as these things are attainable under existing conditions. In a society where poverty means social discredit, where misfortune is treated as a crime, where the prison or the workhouse is the guerdon of failure, and the bitter carking harassment of daily wants unmet by daily supply is ever hanging over the head of each worker, what wonder that money seems the one thing needful, and that every other thought is lost in the frenzied rush to escape all that is summed up in the one word poverty?

But this abnormal development of the gold-hunger would disappear upon the certainty for each of the means of subsistence. Let each individual feel absolutely secure of subsistence—let every anxiety as to the material wants of his future be swept away; and the longing for wealth will lose its leverage. The daily bread being certain, the tyranny of pecuniary gain will be broken; and life will begin to be used in living and not in struggling for the chance to live. Then will come to the front all those multifarious motives which are at work in the complex human organism even now, and which will assume their proper importance when the basis of physical life is assured. The desire to excel, the joy in creative work, the longing to improve, the eagerness to win social approval, the instinct of benevolence: all these will start into full life, and will serve at once as the stimulus to labour and the reward of excellence. It is instructive to notice that these very forces may already be seen at work in every case in which subsistence is secured, and they alone supply the stimulus to action. The soldier's subsistence is certain, and does not depend on his exertions. At once he becomes susceptible to appeals to his patriotism, to his *esprit de corps*, to the honour of his flag: he will dare anything for glory, and value a bit of bronze, which is the "reward of valour," far more than a hundred times its weight in gold. Yet many of the private soldiers come from the worst of the population; and military glory and success in murder are but poor objects to aim at. If so much can be done under circumstances so unpromising, what may we not expect from nobler aspirations? Or take the eagerness, self-denial, and strenuous effort, thrown by young men into their mere games! The desire to be captain of the Oxford eleven, stroke of the Cambridge boat, victor in the foot-race or the leaping—in a word, the desire to excel—is strong enough to impel to exertions which often ruin physical health. Everywhere we see the multiform desires of humanity assert themselves when once livelihood is secure. It is on the devotion of these to the service of society, as the development of the social instincts teaches men to identify their interests with those of the community, that Socialism must ultimately rely for progress; but in saying this we are only saying that Socialism relies for progress on human nature as a whole, instead of on that mere fragment of it known as the desire for gain.

CHAPTER IV.

THE HISTORY OF SOCIALISM.

Socialism of the modern type, if a date must be fixed, may be said to have begun in 1817, the year when Robert Owen laid before Parliament his plan for a Socialistic community, the year when the speculations of Saint-Simon took a definitely Socialistic direction, the year when Lamennais published his first work looking towards Christian Socialism. Nevertheless, he who does not go back of the present century will never understand Socialism. Socialism in a very real sense is as old as human society. Laveleye in his *Primitive Property* has shown how in the earliest times which history can trace, property, at least land, was held not by private individuals, but held and operated collectively and more or less for the common good. It is true that this was hardly a primitive Communism, as Laveleye claims; for as F. de Coulanges and others have pointed out, although the property was held collectively and not by individuals, it was held practically, if not nominally, by the despot or feudal head of the society, and worked by his slaves or subjects mainly for his advantage. It was primitive slavery rather than primitive Communism. Nevertheless, it did contain some elements of Socialism, which occasionally developed into institutions, somewhat actually Socialistic. From such germs came, *e.g.*, the Russian *mir*, the Javan *dessa*, the Swiss *almends*, the German *mark*, the communal families and the family communities that still linger in out-of-the-way corners of France, Italy, and Eastern Europe. We have, however, in ancient history much more direct instances of Socialism. Athens may almost be said to have been, *as far as its free citizens went*, a Socialistic city. It was, as far as this portion of its population went, democratically governed, and the city as a city owned and operated land, mines, forests, fields; it built temples, baths, theatres, gymnasia; it controlled and conducted commerce, art, worship, games; it supported its citizens, more than it was supported by them: the whole Greek social conception was that the individual lived for the State, rather than the State for the individual.

Still more Socialistic was the Hebrew theocracy. All land was held, according to this theocracy, as belonging to God alone and to no individual in fee simple. Every one, however, who belonged to the theocracy—notice that he must belong to the organisation to gain its advantages—was defended not in the ownership, but in the inalienable *use* of land and capital. He could not be permanently alienated from the land (Leviticus xxv.). If he was poor his property, or capital, could not be kept from him overnight (Deuteronomy xxvi. 10-13). The law by its institutions defended the fatherless, the hireling, the stranger, the poor, the oppressed, the widow. For a fuller development of this, see our book soon to appear, *Christian Socialism.*

All through the ancient world were scattered religious sects, like the Essenes, the Therapeutæ, who lived in communities having all property common. Through all early societies religion and Communism are found hand in hand. Coming to the Christian era we have the early attempts at Communism in the primitive churches and later the monastic institutions, which were to a large extent the civilising centres of the Middle Ages. Feudalism was the prevailing social form; yet was its harshness tempered by the duty, more or less recognised, of the feudal lord to care for and protect his inferior. According to Rogers, in England, every serf who did a little work was entitled to a cottage and a little land practically rent free. Prior to and immediately after the Reformation there were many attempts at Communism; John Ball (see Appendix A) may be considered a mediæval Christian Socialist; while the Anabaptists in Germany, before they developed their sexual excesses, attempted in many ways a true Communism. Such, too, were the attempts of the *Brethren of the Common Life*, of the *Libertines* of Geneva, of the *Familists* of Holland, and of other similar sects whose traditions have given us in our own day the Communistic colonies in America, of the Separatists, and similar sects at Economey, Zoar, and Amana. Indeed no fact in history is more marked than the persistence of the ideal and of the attempts to realise the ideal of the life in common. Plato dreamed of such a community in his *Republic;* the writings of the Christian Fathers are full of this ideal. In 1516 More published his *Utopia;* about 1600 Campanella his *City of the Sun;* in 1656 Harrington his *Oceana.* These, and many other less known writings (for a fuller list see Appendix E), kept alive an ideal that has never wholly been apart from human thought. Such, in brief, is an outline of what may be called the germs of Socialism before our century.

We now come to consider

THE ORIGIN OF MODERN SOCIALISM.

Back of Socialism, as Mr. Kidd in his *Social Evolution* has recently well pointed out (even though his explanation of the fact be not accepted), lies the altruistic impulse. Socialism is essentially, and has been from the start, a humanitarian movement. It is not, whatever some would make it, a class movement of the Have nots against the Haves. The major part of its foremost leaders, Owen, Saint-Simon, Gall, Marx, Lassalle, Morris, Hyndman, Vollmar, Bakunin, Kropotkine, belonged originally to the Haves. Weitling, "the father of German Communism," declared that he was converted to Communism by the New Testament. If German Socialism has become completely materialistic, not enough emphasis has been laid on the fact that with Marx, Lassalle, and Bakunin, their Socialistic philosophy was derived primarily from Hegel, the most spiritual of modern philosophers, unless it be that of Fichte, who was himself a Christian Socialist. In France, Saint-Simon, Fourier, Lamennais, and Cabet were profoundly religious. If, in England, this cannot be said of Owen, no one can doubt his intense altruistic or humanitarian impulse. The story of the personal sacrifices made by Socialists for Socialism never has been, and perhaps never will be, written. The Christian martyrs gave their lives expecting immediately to enter Paradise ; Socialists have again and again given and devoted their lives to the cause, knowing of no Paradise, save one their children alone can enter. Altruism (originally, as we believe, sprung from the Christian faith, but, in any case, altruism) is the one great motive that has produced Socialism. The occasion, however, was industrial. It is to be found in the sudden inventions of machinery and steam power, enabling successful production to be conducted with the aid of capital alone ; and hence putting the working class wholly, as they were in part before, in the hands of the possessing classes, thus increasing the wealth of the latter without a similar increase in the wealth of the masses, this revolution occurring even while altruism was more and more teaching the doctrines of human equality and of the general unity of mankind.

"Socialism," says Sidney Webb, "is one of the unforeseen results of the great industrial revolution of the past one hundred and fifty years. During this period man's power over the rest of nature has suddenly and largely increased : new means of accumulating wealth, and also new means of utilising land and capital, have come into being. At the beginning of the last century, the whole value of the land and capital of England is estimated to have amounted to less than £500,000,000 sterling ; now it is supposed to be over £9,000,000,000 ; an increase eighteenfold. Two hundred years ago, rent and interest cannot have amounted to £30,000,000 sterling annually ; now they absorb over £450,000,000. Socialism arose as soon as rent and interest became important factors."

The Socialist movement, thus born, and thus occasioned, has been composed of these elements : the aim at personal liberty, the effort to secure this through industrial co-operation, the recognition that this co-operation to be successful must include the whole community organised as a fraternal unit. Generally speaking, the contribution of the first element came from France, of the second element from England, and of the third element from Germany. France in her Revolution, and in the philosophical writings of

Rousseau, Morelly, Mably, and Brissot de Warville, aimed at personal liberty. Owen and the English Christian Socialists taught the benefit of co-operation. Hegel, Fichte, Lassalle, and Marx developed the ideal of the co-operative State.

The French Revolution was not Socialistic, but necessary to Socialism. The old *régime* had to be overthrown. The fatal despotism of the Louises led to Robespierre and Danton. Crimson on the throne could only create crimson in the streets. The French Revolution was necessary before Socialism could be. In other countries, where the old despotisms were less absolute, the same negative process of destruction, in order to construction, was gone through, but with far less of violence. In Germany it was largely accomplished by the Stein-Hardenberg legislation. In England the political economy of Adam Smith and the gradual legislation abolishing the old grants and restrictions of trade did the same work. By 1817, France and England were ready for Socialism.

For the actual beginnings of Socialism, however, one must look to Robert Owen at New Lanark, and his appeal to Parliament to carry out his Socialistic ideals; one must turn next to Saint-Simon and his dreams of a scientific Church, whose life should be to aid the poor; one must study Fourier, and ponder over the power of unity; one must read Fichte and Hegel, and learn their philosophy of the Christian State, a philosophy which, when the Church failed to accept it, produced the materialistic movement of Lassalle and of Karl Marx. We shall study these details in the history of Socialism in the separate countries (chaps. v. to xii.), and in the lives of the Socialists themselves (see Appendix A). We can here only mark out

THE PERIODS OF SOCIALISM.

Five of these great periods are distinctly marked. I. A negative or preparatory period, beginning with the French Revolution and coming down to 1817. II. A formative or utopian period, lasting till 1848, and including the utopian schemes of Owen, Saint-Simon, Fourier, Cabet, and others of lesser note. It culminated in the revolutions of 1848. III. A period of reaction, or at least of inaction, when Europe, as far as Socialism went, was lying fallow, from 1849 to 1863. IV. The period of the International, from its foundation in London in 1864 to its virtual disrupture in the separation of the Socialists and the Anarchists in the Congress at the Hague in 1872. V. The present period of the Social Democratic Movement, commencing after the breaking up of the International, but becoming active in most countries outside of Germany only in 1880 to 1883.

In the first period men were simply striving for personal liberty, with little consciousness of how it could be reached. Hegel and Fichte outlined indeed advanced conceptions of the Christian State, but they had little effect on the politics of their day. Fourier wrote his strange dreams. England in 1802 began to toy with industrial legislation, and Owen to experiment at New Lanark; but far more characteristic of the period was the teaching of Adam Smith and the negations of the French Revolution, with the philosophy of the return to nature and of the rights of man, so brilliantly stated by Rousseau and his school, and perhaps affecting no country in the world so much as the United States of America, then just shaping its Constitution.

In the second period, Owen, Saint-Simon, Lamennais, Cabet, the great Fourierist school, even Lassalle, dreamed of ideal co-operative communities, and attempted them in France, Great Britain, and above all in numerous colonies and communities in the United States. Towards the end of the period, the awakening ferment, led by Lassalle, Marx, Engels, and others, produced the Communist Manifesto of 1848, and perhaps more than has been realised the political and socialistic revolutions of 1848.

But the times were not ripe. Even in France, Louis Blanc protested against the false Socialism of the *Ateliers Nationaux*; and for a while Socialism seemed dead. In this period Europe was lying fallow.

At last, in the fourth period, in the great International Working Men's Association, founded in London in 1864, largely under the influence of Karl Marx, revolutionary Socialism broke upon

Europe as a flood. "Workmen of all countries, unite!" such was the cry. The night of dreams was over, the hour was come to act. Workmen of all countries tried to unite; but being in very different degrees of economic and industrial development, the International came to stand in different countries for very different things. In England it meant little more than Trades Unionism; and when English workmen found that on the Continent it meant more they virtually left it. In Germany it meant Socialism; in most other European countries, mainly under the influence of Bakunin, it came to mean Anarchism. This apostle of destruction, crazed by years of suffering in Russian prisons and Siberian exile, knew only the gospel of "pan-destruction". Falling like a firebrand into the International, he carried it in almost all the Latin countries, including Southern France and parts of Belgium and other countries, into Anarchism. It wrecked the International. Marx, in the greatest deed of his life, drove out the Anarchists from the Congress at the Hague in 1873, and wrecking the International once for all, saved Socialism from the scourge that Anarchism has since proved to modern Europe. The Bakunin "Autonomist" congresses tried to continue the International, but unsuccessfully, and with the failure the period closed.

The last period is the present one. Socialism, for some years quiet after its break with the Anarchists, about 1880 to 1883 gradually assumed constructive, evolutionary, political form, wholly free from Anarchism, yet without any sacrifice of its aim at a complete industrial revolution. Social Democracy is in this period its favourite name.

Details must be sought in our chapters on the various countries; but it must not be forgotten that Socialism is distinctly both an international and a national movement. Its international character is marked first in the fact that in all European countries it has passed through the above five periods almost synchronously, and *secondly*, in its positive efforts at internationalism. This was marked first in the International itself, and secondly, in the modern international congresses, which are an important characteristic of the present movement. The International failed as an organised movement, because the movement in the different countries had developed such different bodies of thought that they could not coalesce; yet it succeeded in spreading through all Europe the industrial revolution. The modern international Socialist congresses are succeeding, because out of the revolutionary industrial thought there is being evolved a Socialist programme, as well as a Socialist platform, which programme and which platform all countries are finding that, according to their degree of industrial and political development, they must sooner or later accept. An artificial International has given place to a natural internationalism. The latest, and in many respects the most important of these International Congresses took place at Zurich, August 6-13, 1893; the next will be held at London in 1896.

We give, abridged from a reform paper, an account of the Zurich Congress, as it indicates in many ways the exact position of the modern Socialist movement as a whole:—

> The Congress was attended by over 400 delegates, as against 341 at Brussels two years ago; every country in Europe being represented, with the exception of Portugal, Greece, and Turkey, and delegates being present from the United States and Australia. The largest delegation came naturally from Switzerland, all the local working men's societies sending a delegate or two—101 in all. Germany followed with a phalanx of over ninety strong, all Social Democrats, and headed by their triumvirate of leaders, Bebel, Liebknecht, and Singer. England had sixty-five, a large portion of them Trades Union delegates, getting their first taste of international Socialism; and every shade of Socialistic and even Anarchistic opinion finding representatives among the rest. France had a compact body of thirty-eight, which would have been stronger had not the rank and file, as well as all the prominent leaders, been detained at home to carry on the electoral campaign. Belgium sent eighteen, and Holland six, one of them delegated by "the Socialistic Schoolmasters' Society". Italy had a harmonious delegation of twenty-five. Austria and Hungary had together nearly fifty delegates, and Poland was represented as a nation with five. Servia was represented, for the first time, by one delegate. Russia was represented by Plechanoff, who was able to present a letter of credentials from a genuine society of working men in St. Petersburg,

who, in spite of the obstacles in their way, had been able to meet and authorise him to act for them. The United States had three delegates.

Among the delegates of England, Belgium, Germany, Austria, Holland, and Italy were women.

"Companion" Burkli, of "the Swiss Grütli Society," opened the proceedings by a short speech, which was given first in German and then, by himself, in perfect English. He treated upon the organisation of Social Democrats on the Continent, and urged English industrial organisations to join hand in hand with them. The crushing burden of militarism was alluded to, and finally he declared his belief in a law of progress, in which all can share if we will but throw aside capitalism working for profit, which, while bringing increase of wealth to the few, involves the many in ever-increasing misery. After the same address had been delivered in French, "Companion" Greutilch, secretary of the Zurich Labour Bureau, took charge of the congress.

On each day a chairman was selected from some different nationality.

In the afternoon there was a procession of workmen and women and delegates through the streets of Zurich and along the lakeside. It consisted of some thousands of workmen with flags and banners, and was brought up by a number of prettily dressed little girls, walking under arches held by others. They were followed by the gardeners' organisation, each man of which carried a basket of flowers, beautifully arranged, the effect being exceedingly fine.

Among notable inscriptions borne on banners were the following: "The earth for the people and no more taxes;" "Labour is the duty of all. Whosoever does not work ought not to eat." The procession finished at the Schule Platz, where speeches were made.

The Tonhalle itself was bright with flags, and over the platform was a picture of Karl Marx.

Monday's sitting, or, rather, the morning sitting, proved a stormy one. Two Anarchists, with credentials from a Berlin organisation, put in an appearance and demanded recognition. The German delegates, Bebel and Singer, spoke strongly against them. The Frenchmen were all in favour of their admission, so were the Dutch and Belgian delegates. But with the exception of one man, "Companion" Mowbray, the English were against the Anarchists, so also was the American delegation.

The point at issue was that the German Socialists have found that they cannot work with the Anarchists, the method of the latter being simply and always one of obstruction. Hence from the first they made a point of the exclusion of that body. The contest arose over the resolution that "all delegates of working class trades unions, societies, and clubs be admitted; also all Socialist societies and organisations which acknowledge the necessity of organisation of the workers and the necessity of political action ". An amendment was moved by a Frenchman to leave out the words " political action," and the discussion on this point waxed very hot and lasted the whole of the forenoon. Finally, the dinner hour arrived, and during the interval the British delegates agreed that if any business was to be done the discussion would have to be stopped. Hence they empowered their chairman to move the closure. This he did on the resumption of the sitting, and after a warm and somewhat exciting scene the original resolution was carried, and the Anarchist delegates were expelled, but not before some few blows had been struck.

On Tuesday there was a written protest on the part of the Anarchists against their expulsion, which led to further discussion without changing the result.

The question discussed in the afternoon was the important one of the Eight Hours' Day. The committee's report recommended the adoption of the carefully drawn resolutions of the Swiss, the committee having rejected a French amendment coupling the demand for a legislative eight hours' day with a threat of a general strike. After due consideration the committee stuck to a plain declaration in favour of a legislative eight hours' day, national and international, and including the trades unions with the Socialists as the proper hands to carry on the movement, the methods to be used, as defined in the resolution, being perfectly constitutional. The French amendment included a stipulation that the eight hours' legislation should forbid a change of wages (including, of course, a rise as well as a fall), and another that factory inspectors should be appointed by the workers, instead of by Government; but both were rejected by two to one, the English being almost unanimous against them.

On Thursday there was a discussion as to what language the congress should fix (by resolution) as the common tongue of the workers of the world. When it came to voting there was a tie between French and English.

The next question of importance before the congress was that of Peace *v.* War—the question that has most interested the foreign press. The subject was opened by a Dutchman named Domela Nieuwenhius, who may be said to have taken as his text the Biblical words : " Thou shalt not kill ". His resolution proposed that in case of a declaration of war all workers who could have any influence should declare a general strike. A long discussion followed, carried on by a speaker of each nationality. Ultimately the German amendment was carried as a substitute resolution. It is of so much importance that we give it entire :—

" The position of the workers in case of war is defined in a precise manner by the Congress of Brussels on militarism. International social revolutionary democracy should in all cases rise with all the forces in its power against the Chauvinist appetites of the dominant classes ; it ought always to consolidate more narrowly the bonds of solidarity between the workers of all classes; it ought to work without cessation to vanquish the capitalism which has divided humanity into two great hostile camps, and which provokes peoples one against another. With the suppression of the domination of the classes war will also disappear. The downfall of capitalism signifies universal peace. Socialist deputies of all classes should lend their support to all associations which have for their aim universal peace."

This resolution was adopted by fourteen nations against four. The nations which voted in favour of the Dutch resolution were France, Holland, Australia, and Norway. It is worthy of remark that a Norwegian delegate, Johanssen, spoke strongly in favour of a military strike in case of war between Norway and Sweden. The United States delegates abstained from voting.

On Friday the congress discussed the subject of the May Day Demonstration, and in the end it adopted a resolution in favour of such demonstrations in all countries in the interest of an eight hours' day. Other resolutions were passed in favour of universal peace, and calling upon labour representatives to endeavour to obtain better legislation for the protection of women in respect to their hours of work and conditions of employment. The measures demanded on this question were as follows:—

1. A maximum working day of eight hours for women, and of six hours for young persons under 18.
2. Cessation of work for thirty-six consecutive hours in every week.
3. Prohibition of night labour.
4. Prohibition of labour in all trades especially dangerous to health.
5. Prohibition of women working two weeks before, and four weeks after confinement.
6. The appointment of an adequate number of women inspectors for all trades and industries in which women are employed.
7. The above provisions to apply to all girls and women employed in factories, workshops, shops, home industries, and in agricultural labour.

The last noteworthy event of the congress was an address by Engels, the intimate and now veteran friend of Marx.

Such is a picture of modern international Socialism. The same spirit is manifest in the May Day Demonstrations, which are now celebrated, occasionally by strikes and sometimes by violence, but usually by quiet, monster open-air demonstrations, in such cities as London, Berlin, Vienna, Paris, and New York, bringing together many tens or even hundreds of thousands of working people.

From this view of Socialism as a whole, we turn to study it by countries.

CHAPTER V.

SOCIALISM IN ENGLAND.

ENGLISH Socialism is peculiarly the product of English national characteristics. A sturdy independence coupled with a genius for political organisation is the birthright of every Englishman; and, applied in industry, could, when the times were ripe, only produce Socialism. As early as 1360 did John Ball, "the mad priest of Kent," preach a mediæval Christian Socialism, asking in the name of the common folk, by what right men called lords were greater folk than they, and declaring that only by the toil of the villeins, these lords held their estates. Hanged at St. Alban's for his bold words as well as for the large part he played in the Peasants' Revolt, his spirit has never wholly died away, and continually reappears in the most unexpected quarters. One finds it alike in the rough poetry of Langland's *Piers Plowman* (1377), and in the courtly words of More's *Utopia* (1516). It enters in milder form into Erasmus' *Christian Prince*, and again in Harrington's *Oceana* (1656). It is voiced in Beller's proposed *College of Industry* (1695), and in Spence's land nationalisation of 1775. In the sixteenth century the nobles, impoverished by the long French wars, and the wars of the Roses, drove out many of their humble folk, and turned their fields into sheep walks, for the raising of wool for the Flemish market, and at the same time fenced in many of the commons, calling forth the noble protest of Latimer's sermons. This robbery of the land, by those who were its rulers but not its owners, together with the confiscation of the monasteries and other causes, produced the landless class and made necessary the Poor Laws of Elizabeth. These laws, although turned by remorseless magistrates into a means of the degradation of England's poor, contained, nevertheless, the Socialistic claim of the right of every man to receive opportunity for life and work, from the State.

The contest with Charles, the Puritan Commonwealth, the English Revolution, were not movements of the industrial classes; yet they have made English legislative Socialism possible, and, though based upon an individualistic philosophy, contained many noble lessons of equality, and produced many a brave democratic spirit.

When, in the eighteenth century, the inventions of steam-power and machine-production developed modern industrial England, it caused an economic revolution. Under the *laissez faire* teachings of Adam Smith, trade grew to be without restraint; manufacturers robbed cottages of their women and cradles of their children, to employ them in factories utterly without sanitation, coining their blood into fabulous profits. Employees were worked like slaves and housed more poorly than the beasts, the whispers of Malthusianism quieting any stirrings of the conscience. It was necessary that men be killed, it was said, there was not room for all. Wages were lowest and hours of labour longest just about the beginning of the century. Then came the change which, before we know it, carries us into modern Socialism. It began with industrial legislation.

In 1795, Dr. Aikin, a Manchester physician, published a statement concerning the evil condition of the children working in the mills. In 1796 a committee was formed in Manchester to inquire into the health of the poor. In 1802 the elder Peel brought in and passed the first Bill for the preservation of the health and morals of apprentices and of others employed in cotton and other factories. It immediately accomplished nothing, being fatally defective; but it established the principle. Other Bills introduced did little more. In 1824 a Bill was passed mainly owing to the efforts of Francis Place, outside of Parliament, and Joseph Hume within, giving trades unions, which had secretly existed since about 1700, the right to publicly organise. In 1830 Richard Oastler, speaking for the anti-slavery movement, discovered that there was "white slavery" in England, and from that date gave his time and strength, in poverty, and even when imprisoned for debt, to exposing the facts of factory evils, and agitating for legislation. He accomplished little, however, till Lord Ashley, afterwards the Earl of Shaftesbury, took up his cause. T. Sadler, in 1831, had moved a Ten Hours' Bill, but to no effect. A select committee was appointed in the matter in 1832, but only to gain time and prevent action. Lord Ashley, however, now taking hold, brought in a Ten Hours' Bill for Women and Children, which was read a second time in 1833. It was violently opposed, even by such individualists as Richard Cobden and John Bright. Finally, Lord Althorp brought in for the Government and carried a Compromise Bill, which was better than nothing. Oastler, however, continued his agitation. Children's Employment Commissions of 1842 and 1843 published terrible revelations. A Factory Act was passed in 1844, and finally the Ten Hours' Bill in 1847.

Meanwhile Robert Owen, at his mills in New Lanark, had been putting in practice various reforms, and in the year 1817 laid a scheme of a Socialistic community before the House of Commons. This act is sometimes considered the beginning of Socialism in England; but it was not Socialism as we understand the word today. Owen's utopianism and evolutionary Social Democracy in industry have little in common. In 1825 Owen purchased New Harmony in the United States, and started his short-lived community. In 1835 he founded an Association of all Classes of all Nations; and during the discussions which arose over this the words Socialism and Socialist seemed first to have been used and thence to have been borrowed by the French writer Reybaud, in his *Reformateurs Modernes* (1839). But events were moving on. In 1832 the Reform Bill was passed. From 1839 to 1849 we have the great Chartist agitation, which, though nominally political in its demands, really scattered the seeds of the social movement through all England. The close of the Chartist agitation witnessed the birth of organised Christian Socialism. Stirred by the events of the Chartist uprising and moved by the sufferings peculiarly of the sweated tailors in London, and of the agricultural labourers in the country, Charles Kingsley and Frederick Denison Maurice, clergymen of the Church of England, with E. Vansittart Neale, Thomas Hughes, J. M. Ludlow (the starter of the movement), organised a society under the avowed name of Christian Socialism (suggested by Maurice). They published pamphlets and two papers and started some co-operative stores. Their papers were soon discontinued; their stores either failed or were swallowed up in the larger Rochdale co-operative movement; but their thought lived. It is true it did not live as Christian Socialism in the form they cast it. By Christian Socialism, so far as active efforts went, they simply meant co-operation; but their deeper thought that competition was not the law of trade, but that God's law of brotherhood and sacrifice must be applied in industry—this has lived and is stirring all Church thought to-day. Kingsley's bold denunciation of the soulless Manchester school of political economy, his brilliant pictures of the sufferings and efforts of the poor, sketched in *Yeast* (1848) and in *Alton Locke* (1850), and the deeper philosophy of Maurice, are still potent to-day.

Yet, after 1850, for thirty long years we seem to come to a gap in the advance of Socialism. In the collapse of Chartism and the failure of the social efforts of Owen and the early Christian Socialists, the political movement had become social and the social movement only slightly political. After the revolutions of '48 on the Continent little was heard from thence about Socialism. It was commonly said that Socialism was dead; yet was the silence only on the surface. From 1850 to 1880 English Trades Unionism was taking form and growing, with many ups and downs, into its present strength. The Rochdale co-operative movement, beginning in 1844, during this period made its phenomenal advance. The writings of Carlyle and of Ruskin were striking strong blows against the immoralities of the orthodox political economy. In 1848 Mill published his *Political Economy*, an influence towards Socialism which must not be overlooked, since it introduced a new spirit into economics, and one largely in the Socialistic direction. Henceforth, political economy was no longer to be a dismal science of bloodless theories, but a scientific discussion of how to meet practical industrial problems. Mill himself, in his *Autobiography*, came to announce himself a Socialist. There were other radical forces at work. From 1849 to his death in 1883 Marx resided in London. Here, too, was the home of Engels, his life-long friend. In London, also, was Mazzini. Opposed to Socialism, as it was presented to him, he really preached the deepest and most ethical Socialism. As early as 1847 Marx and Engels, corresponding with a London society, turned this society into a Communist League; and the following year published, from Brussels, the Manifesto of the Communist party, the first formal utterance of Marxian Socialism. Naturally, around Marx and Engels in London grew a little party of followers, not wholly foreigners. In 1862 a party of French working men visited the International Exhibition in London and got into communication with English trades unionists; and on September 28, 1864, the famous *International* was founded at St. Martin's Hall, London. Prof. Beesly presided, and Karl Marx was present. It was not at first a Socialistic organisation. Its simple aim was to unite the working men of all countries. Naturally, it took a different colouring with different nations. In Southern Europe it came, under the influence of Bakunin, to stand for violent Anarchism; in Germany, it developed Socialism; in France and Belgium, it was partly the one, partly the other; in England, it meant little more than an attempt at International Trades Unionism. An organisation so at variance in itself could not endure. At the Congress at the Hague in 1872 the Socialists and Anarchists, under the lead respectively of Marx and Bakunin, finally separated. The English members had, however, practically renounced the International long before on finding what the International meant upon the Continent. This accounts, in fact, at once for the first connection of English trades unionism with Continental Socialism, and the temporary rejection of Socialism under that name by the English trades unionist. Be this as it may, the International scarcely existed in England, and no avowedly Socialist Society till 1881.

Little as he intended it, the lectures in England of Henry George, individualist as he now proclaims himself, seem to have been the occasion for the first crystallisation in England of modern Socialist thought. His sharp words on the Land Question, and the enormous circulation of *Progress and Poverty*, aroused general interest; yet, when organisation came, the forces we have seen already at work produced Socialism. Says Sidney Webb, in his *Socialism in England:* "The coercive measures introduced by Mr. Gladstone's Ministry against the Irish Land League had alienated many of the earnest Radicals from the Liberal party; and these were still further repelled by the 'untoward events' which were happening in Egypt. It became evident that 'Liberalism' was not inconsistent with shameless international aggression in the interests of the officers and the bondholders. The years of Mr. Gladstone's administration were successively frittered away without any real effort to accomplish social reforms. The neglect of English social questions became more and more pressingly felt, and it was mainly the feeling due to these political incidents that caused the first definitely Socialist organisation to arise. This was a body called the 'Democratic Federation,' founded in March, 1881, by the efforts of Mr. H. M. Hyndman, Mr. Herbert Burrows, Miss Helen Taylor (stepdaughter of John Stuart Mill), and some others. Mr. Joseph Cowen, at that time member of Parliament for Newcastle-on-Tyne, a life-long Democrat, was one of the active helpers from the first, although this was not publicly known. The only distinctively Socialist proposal explicitly set forth in the first programme of this organisation was 'Nationalisation of the Land,' placed ninth in the list; but it was from the first essentially a Socialist body, and it changed its name in August, 1884, to the 'Social Democratic Federation'. Under this title it became a propagandist organisation of great effect in London and many of the provincial industrial centres, having scores of energetic branches."

This Federation has been the largest, and in many ways the most active, of all English Socialist Societies. It has held constant open-air meetings and popular demonstrations, sometimes of enormous size. Its leading spirit has been, and still is, Mr. H. M. Hyndman, a man of university education and of some means, who has consecrated his life to its cause. He has been ably seconded at different times by Herbert Burrows, John Burns, H. H. Champion, Tom Mann, Wm. Morris, Annie Besant, and many others. Its organ is *Justice*, a weekly commenced in 1884, and continued to the present time, since 1886, under the editorship of Mr. H. Quelch.

The following is the present programme of the Social Democratic Federation :—

Object.

The socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange to be controlled by a Democratic State in the interest of the entire community, and the complete emancipation of labour from the domination of capitalism and landlordism, with the establishment of social and economic equality between the sexes.

Programme.

I.—All officers or administrators to be elected by equal direct adult suffrage and to be paid by the community.

II.—Legislation by the people in such wise that no project of law shall become legally binding till accepted by the majority of the people.

III.—The abolition of a standing army, and the establishment of a national citizen force ; the people to decide on peace or war.

IV.—All education, higher no less than elementary, to be compulsory, secular, industrial, and gratuitous for all alike.

V.—The administration of justice to be gratuitous for all members of society.

VI.—The land, with all the mines, railways and other means of transit, to be declared and treated as collective or common property.

VII.—The means of production, distribution, and exchange to be declared and treated as collective or common property.

VIII.—The production and distribution of wealth to be regulated by society in the common interests of all its members.

Palliatives.

As measures called for to palliate the evils of our existing society the Social Democratic Federation urges for immediate adoption :—

The compulsory construction of healthy dwellings for the people, and such dwellings to be let at rents to cover the cost of construction and maintenance alone.

Free, secular, and technical education, compulsory upon all classes, together with free maintenance for the children in all Board schools.

Eight hours or less to be the normal working day fixed in all trades and industries by legislative enactment, or not more than forty-eight hours per week; penalties to be inflicted for any infringement of this law.

Cumulative taxation upon all incomes exceeding £300 a year.

State appropriation of railways; municipal ownership and control of gas, electric light, and water supplies; the organisation of tramway and omnibus services and similar monopolies in the interests of the entire community.

The extension of the Post Office Savings Bank, which shall absorb all private institutions that derive a profit from operations in money or credit.

Repudiation of the National Debt.

Nationalisation of the land, and organisation of agricultural and industrial armies under State and municipal control on co-operative principles.

As means for the peaceful attainment of these objects the Social Democratic Federation advocates:—

Payment of Members of Parliament and all local bodies and official expenses of elections out of the public funds. Adult suffrage. Annual Parliaments. Proportional representation. Second ballot. Abolition of the monarchy and the House of Lords. Disestablishment and disendowment of all State Churches. Extension of the powers of County Councils. The establishment of District Councils. Legislative independence to all parts of the empire.

The Federation takes active part in politics, nominating candidates of its own wherever possible, and exerting an increasing influence among the working classes.

At the end of 1884, however, Wm. Morris, "artist, poet, Socialist," withdrew from the Federation, and with others formed the *Socialist League.* The grounds of secession were mainly personal, but the new society soon developed a policy of its own, standing, in contrast with the Federation, for a more communistic and less governmental conception of Socialism. Publishing the *Commonweal* (1885), to which Mr. Morris gave many of his brilliant contributions, it exerted no small influence. About 1892, however, the organisation and the *Commonweal* came under Anarchist control; Mr. Morris withdrew, and the organisation has virtually died.

A far more potent and unique organisation of English Socialists is the Fabian Society, founded in 1883, and to-day still adding to its strength. Commenced mainly as an educational and propagandist centre, it includes members of other societies, and has met with unparalleled success. Its members, going into every club where they could get a hearing, have really changed the tone of London. Ten years ago the characteristic note of the London working men's clubs was one of negative Radicalism. To-day it is one of positive Collectivism. Many trades unionists belong to it, including such names as Tom Mann and Ben Tillett. Equally influential has the society been in politics. By manifestoes, tracts, and articles in papers and magazines (this political portion of the work largely done by Sidney Webb) a Socialist programme has been placed before the political public, and the two great parties have been led to seek votes by adopting portion after portion of this programme. An important course of seven lectures by members of the society (George Bernard Shaw, Sidney Webb, LL.B., William Clarke, M.A., S. Olivier, B.A., Graham Wallas, M.A., Annie Besant and Hubert Bland), entitled *Fabian Essays in Socialism*, was published in 1889 and has reached an enormous sale. The society, too, exercises a considerable influence, more real than apparent, by the personal participation of its members in nearly all reform movements, as well as by their work at the universities and in the fields of journalism and the teaching of political economy. The lectures given by members of the society number several thousand a year. Its headquarters at 276 Strand, London (E. R. Pease, secretary), are a centre from which tracts (three-quarters of a million between 1887 and 1893) and other Socialist literature go all over the English-speaking world. There are over fifty local Fabian Societies, formed in most of the important English cities; and it is altogether one of the most active and successful organisations of its kind in existence.

The following are its declared principles:—

The Fabian Society consists of Socialists. It therefore aims at the reorganisation of society by the emancipation of land and industrial capital from individual and class ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general benefit. In this way only can the natural and acquired advantages of the country be equitably shared by the whole people.

The society accordingly works for the extinction of private property in land, and of the consequent individual appropriation, in the form of rent, of the price paid for permission to use the earth, as well as for the advantages of superior soils and sites.

The society, further, works for the transfer to the community of the administration of such industrial capital as can conveniently be managed socially. For, owing to the monopoly of the means of production in the past, industrial inventions and the transformation of surplus income into capital have mainly enriched the proprietary class, the worker being now dependent on that class for leave to earn a living.

If these measures be carried out, without compensation (though not without such relief to expropriated individuals as may seem fit to the community), rent and interest will be added to the reward of labour, the idle class now living on the labour of others will necessarily disappear, and practical equality of opportunity will be maintained by the spontaneous action of economic forces with much less interference with personal liberty than the present system entails.

For the attainment of these ends the Fabian Society looks to the spread of Socialist opinions, and the social and political changes consequent thereon. It seeks to promote these by the general dissemination of knowledge as to the relation between the individual and society in its economic, ethical, and political aspects.

Such are the three main societies of English Socialists; but they form but a small part of the real English Socialist movement. Political and industrial dissatisfaction, coupled with the efforts of these societies, have largely captured the English trades unions for Socialism, till, at their last congress, they voted by an overwhelming majority to select as Labour candidates only those who would declare for a Collectivist programme. This union of Socialism and Trades Unionism, under the name of the New Trades Unionism, is, however, not the only sign of the times. At present the great co-operative movement is seeing the need of Socialism, while the Socialists are widening their programme so as to conceive of co-operation as an aid to, though not a portion of, the direct Socialist movement. This tendency to union is everywhere marked in England. The three main schools of English Socialists have come to an expressed unity in the following Manifesto of the Joint Committee of Socialist Bodies :—

There is a growing feeling at the present time that, in view of the increasing number of Socialists in Great Britain, an effort should be made to show that, whatever differences may have arisen between them in the past, all who can fairly be called Socialists are agreed in their main principles of thought and action.

This is the more hopeful since, though much has been made of those differences by the opponents of Socialism, it is safe to say that they have been rather of less than more importance than similar disputes of the early days of great movements which have afterwards become solid and irresistible. There has, indeed, been constant co-operation in propagandist work between the individual members of different organisations, and occasional co-operation between the organisations in political emergencies; but more than this is now needed if we are to make a serious advance in the work of gathering together and directing the great body of thought and feeling which is setting towards Socialism.

Meanwhile the necessity for the development of a new social order is getting more obvious to all thinking people, and without the growing aspirations towards Socialism the outlook of modern civilisation would be hopeless.

The vigorous propaganda which has been carried on for the last twelve years, and the complete change in the attitude of the working classes and the public generally towards Socialism, could not but attract the notice, and perhaps excite the anxiety, of the politicians of the possessing classes; but they have shown hitherto that they have lacked both the will and the power to do anything effective towards meeting the evils engendered by our present system. In spite of factory acts and factory inspectors, in spite of sanitary legislation and royal commissions, the condition of the working people is, relatively to the increased wealth of the country, worse than it was twenty years ago. Children are still growing up among such surroundings, and so insufficiently nourished that health and strength are for them an impossibility; dangerous and unwholesome trades, inflicting hideous diseases on those who work at them, are still carried on by the capitalists with impunity; overcrowding, accompanied by increasing rents, is the rule rather than the exception in all our great cities.

At the same time the great and growing depression in the most vital of industries, agriculture, tends to drive the people more and more from the country into the towns, while it so narrows the field from which healthy and vigorous industrial recruits have been drawn in the past that the physical deterioration of our city population is more severely felt than ever before.

Moreover, the question of the unemployed is more pressing to-day than at any recent period. The incapacity of the capitalist class to handle the machinery of production without injury to the community has been demonstrated afresh by the crisis of 1890, itself following upon a very short period of inflation; since which time every department of trade and industry has suffered from lack of initiative and want of confidence and ability among these "organisers of labour". As a result, the numbers of the unemployed have increased rapidly; the prospect of any improvement is still remote; and the stereotyped official assurance that there is no exceptional distress only emphasises the fact that it is prosperity, not distress, which is exceptional. Indeed, the greatest "prosperity" possible under the present system could only lessen the mass of those without occupation, and bring them down to a number manageable by the employers. Meantime small improvements made in deference to the ill-formulated demands of the workers, though for a time they seem almost a social revolution to men ignorant of their own resources and of their capacity for enjoyment, will not really raise the condition of the whole people.

In short, the capitalist system, by which we mean the established plan of farming out our national industries in private property lots, and trusting to the greed of the owners and the competition between them to ensure their productive use, is the only arrangement possible in a society not organised enough to administer its own industry as a national concern. This shiftless method has indeed kept the shop open, so to speak, but at a frightful cost in human degradation, as might have been expected from its basis. All the investigations undertaken with a view to convicting Socialists of exaggeration and one-sidedness in their attacks upon it have shown that the facts are worse than any Socialist dared to surmise, and that half a century of ameliorative regulation by means of factory legislation and the like has failed to weaken the force of former exposures of capitalism.

Among recent anti-Socialist statisticians Mr. Robert Giffen has been led by his own counterblast to Socialism into the exclamation "that no one can contemplate the present condition of the masses without desiring something like a revolution for the better". And the facts as to London poverty, laid bare by Mr. Charles Booth, dispose of the possibility of leaving things as they are; although Mr. Booth, who is a Conservative in politics, undertook his great inquiry expressly to confute what he then thought to be Socialist over-statements. The horrible revelations concerning English home life made by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children have effectually dispelled the illusion that the cruelty and selfishness of the factory and mine have not infected the household, or that society can safely abandon its children to irresponsible private ownership any more than its land and capital.

Under these circumstances of a continued degradation of the really useful part of the population—a consequence as inherent in the present system of ownership as it was in the system of chattel slavery—the need for a new social order is obvious. Some constructive social theory is asked for, and none is offered except the feudal or Tory theory, which is incompatible with democracy, the Manchester or Whig theory, which has broken down in practice, and the Socialist theory. It is, therefore, opportune to remind the public once more of what Socialism means to those who are working for the transformation of our present unsocialist state into a collectivist republic, and who are entirely free from the illusion that the amelioration or "moralisation" of the conditions of capitalist private property can do away with the necessity for abolishing it. Even those readjustments of industry and administration which are Socialist in form will not be permanently useful unless the whole state is merged into an organised commonwealth. Municipalisation, for instance, can only be accepted as Socialism on the condition of its forming a part of national and at last of international Socialism, in which the workers of all nations, while adopting within the borders of their own countries those methods which are rendered necessary by their historic development, can federate upon a common basis of the collective ownership of the great means and instruments of the creation and distribution of wealth, and thus break down national animosities by the solidarity of human interest throughout the civilised world.

On this point all Socialists agree. Our aim, one and all, is to obtain for the whole community complete ownership and control of the means of transport, the means of manufacture, the mines, and the land. Thus we look to put an end for ever to the wage-system, to sweep away all distinctions of class, and eventually to establish national and international communism on a sound basis.

To this end it is imperative on all members of the Socialist party to gather together their forces in order to formulate a definite policy and force on its general acceptance.

But here we must repudiate both the doctrines and tactics of Anarchism. As Socialists we believe that those doctrines and the tactics necessarily resulting from them, though advocated as revolutionary by men who are honest and single-minded, are really reactionary both in theory and practice, and tend to check the advance of our cause. Indeed, so far from hampering the freedom of the individual, as Anarchists hold it will, Socialism will foster that full freedom which Anarchism would inevitably destroy.

As to the means for the attainment of our end, in the first place we

Socialists look for our success to the increasing and energetic promulgation of our views amongst the whole people, and next to the capture and transformation of the great social machinery. In any case, the people have increasingly at hand the power of dominating and controlling the whole political, and through the political, the social forces of the empire.

The first step towards transformation and reorganisation must necessarily be in the direction of the limitation of class robbery, and the consequent raising of the standard of life for the individual. In this direction certain measures have been brought within the scope of practical politics; and we name them as having been urged and supported originally and chiefly by Socialists, and advocated by them still, not, as above said, as solutions of social wrongs, but as tending to lessen the evils of the existing *régime;* so that individuals of the useful classes, having more leisure and less anxiety, may be able to turn their attention to the only real remedy for their position of inferiority—to wit, the supplanting of the present state by a society of equality of condition. When this great change is completely carried out the genuine liberty of all may be secured by the free play of social forces with much less coercive interference than the present system entails.

The following are some of the measures spoken of above:—

An eight hours' law.

Prohibition of child labour for wages.

Free maintenance of all necessitous children.

Equal payment of men and women for equal work.

An adequate minimum wage for all adults employed in the Government and Municipal services, or in any monopolies, such as railways, enjoying State privileges.

Suppression of all sub-contracting and sweating.

Universal suffrage for all adults, men and women alike.

Public payment for all public service.

The inevitable economic development points to the direct absorption by the State, as an organised democracy, of monopolies which have been granted to, or constituted by, companies, and their immediate conversion into public services. But the railway system is of all the monopolies that which could be most easily and conveniently so converted. It is certain that no attempt to reorganise industry on the land can be successful so long as the railways are in private hands, and excessive rates of carriage are charged. Recent events have hastened on the Socialist solution of this particular question; and the disinclination of boards of directors to adopt improvements which would cheapen freight, proves that in this, as in other cases, English capitalists, far from being enlightened by competition, are blinded by it even to their own interests.

In other directions the growth of combination, as with banks, shipping companies, and huge limited liability concerns, organised both for production and distribution, shows that the time is ripe for Socialist organisation. The economic development in this direction is already so far advanced that the socialisation of production and distribution on the economic side of things can easily and at once begin, when the people have made up their minds to overthrow privilege and monopoly. In order to effect the change from capitalism to co-operation, from unconscious revolt to conscious reorganisation, it is necessary that we Socialists should constitute ourselves into a distinct political party with definite aims, marching steadily along our own highway without reference to the convenience of political factions.

We have thus stated the main principles and the broad strategy on which, as we believe, all Socialists may combine to act with vigour. The opportunity for deliberate and determined action is now always with us, and local autonomy in all local matters will still leave the fullest outlet for national and international Socialism. We, therefore, confidently appeal to all Socialists to sink their individual crotchets in a business-like endeavour to realise in our own day that complete communisation of industry for which the economic forms are ready and the minds of the people are almost prepared.

ALFRED BEASLEY.
SAMUEL BULLOCK.
J. E. DOBSON.
W. S. DE MATTOS.
W. H. GRANT.
H. M. HYNDMAN.
WILLIAM MORRIS.
SYDNEY OLIVIER.
TOUZEAU PARRIS.
HARRY QUELCH.
H. B. ROGERS.
GEO. BERNARD SHAW.
WILLIE UTLEY.
SIDNEY WEBB.
ERNEST E. WILLIAMS.

The Joint Committee of the Social Democratic Federation, the Fabian Society, and the Hammersmith Socialist Society.

Signed on behalf of the under-mentioned bodies :—

H. W. LEE, *Secretary, Social Democratic Federation*, 337 Strand, W.C.
EDWARD R. PEASE, *Secretary, Fabian Society*, 276 Strand, W.C.
EMERY WALKER, *Secretary, Hammersmith Socialist Society*, Kelmscott House, Hammersmith.

The movement for Land Nationalisation proper is largely participated in by Socialists, but maintains two independent organisations of importance. The "Land Nationalisation Society" has for its principal exponent the eminent naturalist Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace, who has also recently announced himself a full Socialist. The "English Land Restoration League," a very vigorous organisation of wide-spread influence, adheres more closely to the principles of Mr. Henry George. The Rev. J. E. Symes, Professor of Political Economy at University College, Nottingham, author of *A Short Text-book of Political Economy*, is a member of the Council of this body, which also includes several members of Parliament. This society is conducting a very useful agitation in the rural districts by sending out propagandists with red vans to preach to the agricultural labourers the gospel of Land Nationalisation. Municipalism, however, is perhaps the main practical form that English Socialism is at present taking. The formation of the County Councils, and particularly of the London County Council, to bring together under one control the numberless boards and vestries that had power in various ways in London, was itself a step towards Socialism. Says Prof. Ely (*Socialism and Social Reform*, p. 60): "The drift is unmistakable. Two illustrations will suffice. The London County Council has recently acquired some twenty-one miles of street railways (tramways), and proposes to operate these lines. While the ownership and operation of municipal monopolies does not, of necessity, mean Socialism—while, indeed, an anti-Socialist may favour such ownership and operation—the significant point is that in London the change was brought about by Socialist intent, and as part of a Socialist programme. The second illustration is found in the abolition of the contract system in the construction of artisans' dwellings by the municipality. More and more is the policy being forced of making the County Council do its own work and be the model employer."

The municipalism of cities like Birmingham and Glasgow is well known. Birmingham is perhaps what it was called by Julian Ralph in *Harper's Magazine*, "the best governed city in the world," "a business city, run by business men on business principles". "It builds," he tells us, "its own street railroads, makes and sells its own gas, collects and sells its water supply, raises and sells a great part of the food of its inhabitants, provides them with a free museum, art gallery, and art school, gives them swimming and Turkish baths at less than cost, and interests a larger portion of its people in responsibility for and management of its affairs than any city in the United Kingdom, if not in the world." This is Socialism; as Mr. Ralph says in his closing sentence, "a real Socialism, self-governed and self-imposed". The experience of Glasgow is largely the same. It was recently the most crowded city in Great Britain, excepting Liverpool, and full of every evil. It has now municipal water supply, gas supply, park system, a consolidated market system, a horse-car system leased to a private corporation, but only on terms most favourable to the city, bringing into the city a very large revenue. Says Sidney Webb: "Besides our international relations and the army, navy, police, and the courts of justice, the community now carries on for itself, in some part or another of these islands, the post office, telegraphs, carriage of small commodities, coinage, surveys, the regulation of the currency and note issues, the provision of weights and measures, the making, sweeping, lighting, and repairing of streets, roads, and bridges, life insurance, the grant of annuities, shipbuilding, stockbroking, banking, farming, and money-lending. It provides for many thousands of us from birth to burial—midwifery, nursery, education, board and lodging, vaccination, medical attendance, medicine, public worship, amusements, and interment. It furnishes and maintains its own museums, parks, art galleries, libraries, concert-halls, roads, streets, bridges, markets, slaughter-houses, fire-engines, lighthouses, pilots, ferries, surfboats, steamtugs, lifeboats, cemeteries, public baths, wash-houses, pounds, harbours, piers, wharves, hospitals, dispensaries, gasworks, waterworks, tramways, telegraph cables, allotments, cow meadows, artisans' dwellings, schools, churches, and reading-rooms. It carries on and publishes its own researches in geology, meteorology, statistics, zoology, geography, and even theology. . . . Even in the fields still abandoned to private enterprise, its operations are every day more closely limited, in order that the anarchic competition of private greed, which at the beginning of the century was set up as the only infallibly beneficent principle of social action, may not utterly destroy the State. All this has been done by 'practical' men, ignorant, that is to say, of any scientific sociology, believing Socialism to be the most foolish of dreams, and absolutely ignoring, as they thought, all grandiloquent claims for social reconstruction." Nor have we reached the end. England's industrial legislation is being added to every year; the agitation for the eight hours' day, with adaptations for various trades, being at present particularly prominent and hopeful. So much is Socialism in practical politics, so far are all parties forced, at least nominally, to Socialistic measures, that an independent Labour Party has until recently been scarcely thought necessary. Independent Labour representatives have been in Parliament for some time, and have largely favoured Collectivist measures. In the General Election of 1873-74, no fewer than thirteen "Labour candidates" went to the polls; and Alexander Macdonald and Thomas Burt, the two leading officials of the Miners' National Unions, were elected the first "Labour members" of the House. But this did not lead to any general Trades Union or Socialist political movement. The trades unions were not ready for Socialism. Reacting from the utopian and vague Socialism of Owen, as from the mere political methods of the Chartists, the average trades unionist from 1845 to nearly 1885 took little interest in politics. Although largely enfranchised by the Reform Bill of 1867, English workmen in their trades congresses even rejected amendments in favour of Manhood Suffrage as late as 1882 and 1883. In order to win legal recognition at all for their trades unions, the leaders had had to plant themselves wholly on the middle-class ground of the individual freedom of each man to sell his labour as he pleased, collectively or not. Even after trades unions were themselves in 1871 fully legalised, even then "in restraint of trade" their members were still so liable to prosecution under vague Combination Laws, that the unions were engaged in a battle for mere existence down to 1875. At this date, however, the Liberal Party having been defeated largely by the division of the labour vote, a Conservative Government wiped away the last vestige of the Combination Laws. But this long struggle for life had so indoctrinated their members with the individualist economy, that save for a few leaders, like Allan of the Engineers and Applegarth of the Carpenters, the average trades unionist cared nothing for Parliamentary action. Even when free to act, their very successes made the trades unions Conservative. Men of ability, like Mr. Broadhurst, actually opposed eight-hour legislation; a motion in support of it was defeated by a large majority at a Trades Union Congress as late as 1889. The new trades unionism had to come from new men. The unceasing efforts of the Social Democratic Federation, and especially the agitation in behalf of the unemployed in 1886, resulting in the prosecution at the Old Bailey of Messrs. Hyndman, Burns, Champion, and Williams, led, although they were acquitted, to making Socialism known and somewhat popular among the London masses. The great Dock Strike of 1889 saw the turning of the tide. Messrs. Ben Tillett, Tom Mann, and John Burns, all Socialists, organised the dock labourers, and won. It led to the organisation of other trades thus far unorganised. These new unions followed the new leaders, and the movement began to grow in the rank and file of even the old unions. By 1890 the New Unionism was in the majority in the Trades Congresses. The immediate political result, however, was not the creation of a new party, but the adoption of the Newcastle programme by the Liberals in 1891, and similar utterance on the part of many Conservatives. A Progressivist policy —the furtherance of progressive measures through any party— became the order of the day. This policy has been bitterly attacked by many of the leaders of the Social Democratic Federation, who believed in nothing but a "complete international social revolution". This position, however, caused Messrs. Burns, Mann, and others to leave the Federation, and the Progressivist policy went on. On the London School Board, on the London County Council, and on other political bodies, Progressive Socialists were elected in considerable numbers—Mrs. Annie Besant and the Rev. Stewart Headlam, on the School Board, as early as 1888. In 1889 John Burns was elected from Battersea to the County Council, and in 1892 to Parliament; he also, in

1893, receiving the largest number of votes at the Trades Union Congress as chairman of the Parliamentary Committee.

The Collectivist policy has, however, now become so popular that many desire still more rapid action, and, weary of the vast promises and slight fulfilment of both the Liberal and Conservative parties, have organised (January, 1893), mainly under the lead of Mr. Keir Hardie, also elected M.P., an Independent Labour Party, its object being, as stated in the constitution as amended in February, 1894, "the collective ownership and control of the means of production, distribution, and exchange". This Independent Labour Party is growing rapidly in almost all parts of England, but especially in the North. Some societies have gone over to it in a body, and thousands of individual trades unionists and working men. Such is the present Socialist political condition in England; two old parties slowly being driven to Collectivist measures, in spite of their theories and their wishes; a growing Progressivist constituency, working for Collectivism under any name; a young and enthusiastic Independent Labour Party, committed to Socialism in all except the name; a determined Social Democratic Federation, nominating candidates of its own, and criticising all parties and men who do not keep the name as well as the policy of Socialism to the front. Well may alike the friends and the foes of Socialism declare that Socialism of some kind has the future. Bitterly does Mr. Herbert Spencer, for example, complain that the "numerous Socialistic changes made by Act of Parliament, joined with numerous others presently to be made, will by-and-by be all merged in State Socialism—swallowed in the vast wave which they have little by little raised". Of this the passage of the Parish Councils Act, in 1894, is a noteworthy instance.

Other noteworthy evidences of Socialist progress are the changed position of English political economy, and the changing attitude of the clergy and of the Church. These movements will be considered in other chapters (see chapter xiii. for "Socialism and the Political Economists"). Says Mr. Sidney Webb in his *Socialism in England:* "The scientific difference between the 'orthodox' economists and the economic Socialists has now become mainly one of terminology and relative stress, with the result that one competent economist, not himself a Socialist, publishes regretfully to the world that all the younger men are now Socialists, with many of the professors".

In the Church, the Guild of St. Matthew and the Christian Social Union exert no little influence for a general Socialism; while the Rev. Stewart Headlam, with his paper, the *Church Reformer*, and Mr. Bruce Wallace, with his Brotherhood Church and Trust, are among the most active Socialist workers in London. In Manchester and elsewhere, the Labour Church, led by Mr. John Trevor, is a religious movement wholly outside of the organised churches, but voicing the deep religious side of a part of the English Socialist movement.

Among the best books on English Socialism are: Webb's *Socialism in England;* Hyndman's *Historical Basis of Socialism in England;* Gibbin's *Social Reformers;* Jones' *Life of Owen;* Wood's *English Social Movements;* Mr. and Mrs. Webb's *History of Trades Unionism* (perhaps the best historical survey of English Socialism); Fabian Tract, No. 15, *English Progress towards Social Democracy*, is the best brief statement; General Histories, Newspapers, Parliamentary Reports, etc. Centres of information: *Social Democratic Federation*, 337 Strand, W.C.; Office of *Justice*, 37 Clerkenwell Green, E.C.; *Fabian Society*, 276 Strand, W.C.; *Hammersmith Socialist Society*, Kelmscott House, Hammersmith; *Christian Socialist, Guild of St. Matthew*, 8 Duke Street, Adelphi, W.C.; *Brotherhood Trust*, 17 Fann Street; *Independent Labour Party*, 53 Fleet Street, E.C.; Socialist literature and tracts, Reeves, 185 Fleet Street, E.C.; *Parliamentary Reports*, etc., Eyre & Spottiswoode, East Harding Street, Fleet Street, E.C. For Socialist newspapers, see Appendix C.

CHAPTER VI.

SOCIALISM IN FRANCE.

THE distinguishing note of French Socialism is the dominance given to the conception of the *commune* (the municipality or township). This, however, is not to be confounded with English municipalism, or the conduct of local interests by a parish or county council. The French commune is much more nearly communal in the economic sense of that word. It is in its ideal, as held by French Socialists, and, to some degree actually, in history, the conception of a local and limited Communism. Till one understands this, French Socialism cannot be understood; from it French Socialism springs. This Socialism, like all Socialism, has been a gradual evolution. Ancient Gaul, more thoroughly latinised than any other Roman province outside of Italy, fell a rich prize to the Gothic invaders, and they here developed some of their richest cities and strongest states. Only gradually did Paris raise herself above other cities and develop in France a strongly centralised government, a process largely necessary to rescue France from the weakness in which she was left by the long English wars. Yet all through the country lay the traditions of much local independence and local organisations, sprung from the old feudal basis, with its tendency to a local and paternal Communism, rather than towards strong individualism. These local communes, especially those of the larger cities, stood repeatedly for their rights, and treated with the king sometimes as all but equals. But the process of centralisation went on apace. When in 1358 the Jacquerie rose, under Etienne Marcel, to battle for constitutional liberty, they were mercilessly put down. The Reformation was suppressed in France for political reasons, and the suppression temporarily aided the central government. The Court of the Louises became more brilliant, more despotic, more corrupt than any other Court in Europe. The result could be but a revolution. The French Revolution did in France only what has been done in all other Western countries,—it freed the bourgeoisie. It was not more radical in its economic *aims* or in its *immediate results* than the economic revolution which slowly came into English legislation and English life from the *laissez faire* school of Adam Smith, into Germany with the Stein-Hardenberg legislation, into America with the democracy of Jefferson and the Republicanism of the Federalists. Indeed, the French Revolution was largely produced by English ideas. The philosophy of Rousseau and still more of the Encyclopedists came from the school of Locke. But it took in France, perhaps because of the Gallic character, a more revolutionary and more radical form. The genius of Rousseau, the writings of Mably, of Morelly, of Boissel, of Brissot de Warville, even the land-views of the Physiocrats, filled France with new ideals of the rights of man, and with the conception of government as only just when resting upon the consent of the governed. The French Revolution was far more of an intellectual revolution than the uprising of a starving proletariat. It is doubtful if the French masses at the time of the revolution were suffering more than the dwellers in England's manufacturing centres and in her agricultural hamlets during the same period. But the despotism of the Louises gave to the revolution a violent form. Nowhere else could a Louis say, "I am the State"; nowhere else did absolute monarchy go down in such a whirlpool of passion. The suppression, too, of the French Reformation, the infidelity of the Encyclopedists, the wit of Voltaire, had deprived France of faith. The revolution came "a truth clad in hell fire," yet a truth, and a necessary one. Napoleon's cannon put down the revolution, but could not put down ideas. It could only make France the scene of constant revolution and insurrection. The cries raised were different: for Republicanism, for red Republicanism, for Communism, for Socialism; but through all went the struggle against Monarchy, and the ideal of a commune more or less truly communistic. Even before the revolution the above-named writers had been largely Communists, but they based their Communism on an individualistic philosophy. Sixty years before Proudhon, Brissot de Warville, in 1776, the year of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, the year of American Independence, declared that property (as ordinarily understood) was theft. Babœuf was the first to battle for Communism, in his attempted insurrection of 1797, but held as his ideal an utterly artificial dead equality to be rigidly enforced by the State. The conception of evolutionary Socialism was not yet. Nevertheless, in criticising his ideals, which is so easily done to-day, we must not forget his *Tribun du Peuple*, the first communistic paper of the world. Insurrection crushed, thought was the only outlet. We come, therefore, to a long period of utopian Socialism. Details of each author and school will be found in Appendix A; we do little more than chronicle them here, to bring out the continuity. Fourier in 1808 published his *Théorie des Quatre Mouvements*, with its strange blending of mathematical formulas, of far-reaching thought, and of impractical suggestions for artificial association and forced harmonies. It produced in 1834 Considerant's *Destinée Sociale*, and his attempted phalansteries in France and far away in Texas; besides this it led to Godin's famous *Familistere* at Guise (1859), to the great wave of Fourierist Communism that swept over the United States from 1840 to 1850. Meanwhile Saint-Simon, an aristocrat become revolutionary, dreamed in 1817 of an industrial scientific Collectivist State, and in 1825 of a *Neo-Christianity*, a Church which should introduce social reform. Calling upon the Pope to lead in this, on his refusal Saint-Simon attempted a "religion" of his own, which Bayard and Enfantin developed into brief popularity and still briefer experiment from 1830 to 1833. In 1840 Cabet published his *Voyage en Icarie*, and the colony to Icaria in America was started in 1848. Meanwhile, Colins, Huet, and others were writing, while from England came the theories of Owen and the reports of Chartism. This long period of utopian Socialism was broken by the July Revolution of 1830, and the almost constant attempts of Blanqui to rouse the Paris commune. Blanqui, himself a mystic, a Communist, a revolutionist, in a life spent mainly in prison, by spirited writing and still more spirited deed, immediately effected nothing, indirectly has affected the history of France from 1825 down to the present time, thirteen years after his death.

In 1848 came the revolution, and the endeavour of Louis Blanc, the first modern French Socialist, to introduce State workshops for the unemployed, only, however, to have the experiment taken up and so purposely mismanaged by the Government as to render them ridiculous and to call forth the denunciation of Blanc and his effort to expose the Government. The *coup d'état* and failure of the revolution for a time seemed to kill social agitation, and men said that Socialism was dead. Le Play's Social Reform movement, commenced in 1856 (see Appendix A), can scarcely be called Socialism; but Socialism did revive under the International; although even this, in France as in most Latin countries, became, under the influence of Bakunin, Anarchist Communism rather than Socialism. The overthrow of the empire by the Franco-German War, and the declaration of a Republic, which proved to be a *bourgeois* capitalism, and at first, at least, a weak one, gave the Communists their chance, and they rose and declared the commune in Paris, March 18, 1871, while similar attempts, though less successful, were made in other cities. But even the commune could not last. Its enemies were still too strong. Suppressed, and the Communards banished or compelled to flee, the immediate result was to drive the leaders to more violent utterance and a more revolutionary programme. French Communism became at this time almost purely Anarchistic. Such men as Brousse (see Appendix A) fled to Geneva and declared for Bakunin and Anarchist Communism. Even Guesde (see Appendix A), at this time also in Geneva, did not declare against Bakunin. But a change came. The separation between the Anarchists and the Socialists at the Congress of the International at the Hague clearly defined two separate policies, both aiming at an eventual Communism,—Marx and the Socialists striving for it through a peaceable and political capture of the State; Bakunin and the "Autonomists," or "Anarchist Communists," striving for it through a violent destruction of the State. The latter plan naturally most appealed to the hot blood of men rankling under long oppression; but gradually the more thoughtful came to see the futility of this method and the hopelessness of Anarchy. They saw that Marxian Socialism stood really for a deeper revolution and a more practical and actually a speedier way. In 1876 Guesde returned to Paris a Marxian Socialist. In 1879 amnesty was granted to the Communards, and they returned; Malon from Italy, Brousse from London, where, after leaving Geneva, he had been influenced to Collectivism by Marx himself. A strong party was developed for Collectivism. The *Egalité*, the *Prolétaire*, the *Droits de l'Homme*, more or less formally committed to Collectivism, at least spread the thought. The *Cri du Peuple*, founded and edited by Jules Vallès, had, since 1876, been doing good work. Collectivist ideas began to dominate the trades unions. General congresses of working men were held at Paris in 1876 and Lyons in 1878, and were largely Socialistic. The congress of 1879 at Marseilles was Socialist in everything except name.

But Collectivism was not easily to triumph. French Communist Anarchism was still strong, and represented by men of ability and standing, like Kropotkine and Reclus, still more by spirits of intense and fanatic devotion, such as has furnished the modern dynamiters, a Vaillant and a Henri. It had an organ of marked literary ability, *La Révolte*, founded by Kropotkine in Geneva and transferred to Paris; it had a paper, *Le Père Péinard*, written in Parisian *argot*, and appealing to the workmen of the streets with impassioned violence. Not at once did French Socialism clear itself from such Anarchism. The Socialist movement became divided. The right wing was for bargaining with the political Radicals and for practising co-operation, and was hence called *Opportunist* or *Co-operatist;* the left wing worked with the Anarchists; only the centre was for Marxian Collectivism. In 1880, at the congress at Havre, division became open. The majority favouring independent political Collectivist agitation, the right wing, which desired to work through existing political groups, defected, and formed the *Alliance Socialiste Républicaine*, and held congresses of its own at Paris in 1881 and Bordeaux in 1882. The Anarchist wing renounced Socialism altogether. The great majority, the centre, thus free to act, declared for Marxian Socialism, and formed themselves into the *Parti Ouvrier Socialiste Révolutionnaire de France.* This organisation held a congress at Rheims, November 21, 1881, and declared *Le Prolétaire* its organ.

But even this organisation itself divided. The question was whether to agitate for a complete Socialist programme at once, or for portions of it step by step as might seem at the time possible. Those accepting the latter policy were called *Possibilists*, the former *Guesdists*, from their leader, M. Jules Guesde (see Appendix A).

Still another division took place. M. Brousse split the congress of 1882 at St. Etienne on a vote endorsing, instead of a highly centralised Collectivism, a decentralised one, emphasising the function of the commune. He carried his point, 36 to 27, and formed the *Broussist* group. This group soon became one of the largest, and in 1889 succeeded in electing M. Joffrin to the Chamber of Deputies, while it has frequently had nine members in the Municipal Council of Paris. Brousse himself, however, as we have seen, always changeable, now calls himself a *Republican Radical.* Besides these groups there exists, mainly in the Chamber of Deputies, still another group, founded by followers of the old Communist Blanqui, and hence called *Blanquists.*

Such are still to-day the main French Socialist groups, save that the *Alliance Socialiste Républicaine* has practically ceased to exist as an organisation, and that the Possibilists who do not follow M. Brousse are now called *Allemanists*, from their leader, Jean Allemane, editor of their organ, *Le Parti Ouvrier.* Too much, however, must not be made of these differences. The groups often unite, and their numbers continually change. At first elections in France each Socialist group usually nominates its own candidate; but on second ballots, which are common in the French system, they usually unite on the Socialist candidate of any group who has received the most votes. Moreover, the present tendency is towards a closer union. The National Socialist Congresses have always been attended more or less by all the groups, while the various International Congresses have still further tended to bring the groups together. Nevertheless, this division into groups long kept the movement backward, though perhaps bringing out the development of various points in the theory of Socialism which would otherwise have been undeveloped. As late as 1889, the Socialists cast only 91,000 votes out of 6,847,000, or 1·30 per cent. In 1891, however, they cast 549,000, or nearly 9 per cent.; and in 1893, at least 900,000 votes, increasing the number of their deputies from fifteen to fifty-three, without counting such Socialist Radicals as MM. Goblet and Pelletan, who are now, however, declared Socialists. A French writer in the appendix to Prof. Ely's *Socialism and Social Reform* gives the following statistics as to the present strength of the various groups :—

"The Broussists have more adherents in Paris than the other schools, and the Allemanists are notably in the minority there. In the provinces, on the other hand, the Collectivists are dominant. An exception, however, ought to be made of the Department des Ardennes, where all the Socialists are Allemanists; Jean Baptist Clément, who was the apostle of Socialism and the organiser of the Socialistic forces in this region, belonging to this school.

"The Socialistic party has no representatives in the Senate. In the Chamber of Deputies there are about sixty Socialistic deputies (fifty-three Socialists and seven Socialist Radicals), among whom the following are the most important in each group :—

"*Collectivists :* MM. Guesde, Chauvin, Pierre Vaux.

"*Blanquists :* MM. Vaillant, Chauvières, Walter (recently Mayor of St. Denis), Ernest Roche.

"*Possibilists* (Broussists) : MM. Prudent-Dervilliers, Lavy.

"*Possibilists* (Allemanists) : MM. Fabérot, Groussier, Coutant, Dejeante, Avez, Toussaint.

"*Independents :* MM. Millerand, Jaurès, Viviani, Clovis-Hugues, Sembat, Thierry, Cazes, Goujat, Mirman."

In the Municipal Council of Paris there are seventeen Socialists and nineteen Socialist Radicals.

Says Prof. Ely, concerning French Socialists (*Socialism and Social Reform*, p. 63) :—

"They have become so strong that they do not seem to have been injured by the tendency to reaction necessarily following upon the explosion of the dynamite bomb thrown among the French deputies by the recently executed Anarchist, Vaillant, and the attempts to make the people of France regard the Socialists as responsible appear to have been fruitless. This unquestionably means a great deal.

"It is also significant that Paris, the second city of the world in size, is, like London, under the government of a Socialist Municipal Council, and that some five or six other French cities are governed by Municipal Councils, the majority of whose members are either avowed Socialists or are socialistically inclined.

"The students of France, like those of Germany, seem to be more or less receptive to Socialism ; for a Socialistic society was formed in the student quarter, the well-known Latin Quarter, of Paris in 1891, and it seems to have displayed considerable activity since that time.

"Very nearly the same demands are found in the programmes of all the Socialist schools. Citizen Vaillant (this Vaillant must not be confounded with the recently executed Anarchist) said in one of his latest election circulars that the necessary point of departure was the conquest by the Socialists of the political power, which would lead to the revolution bringing liberty to all, to the annihilation of the capitalistic *régime*, to the emancipation of the working class, to *de facto* equality, to the well-being of the man and the citizen in the solidarity of the Social Republic. M. Vaillant demanded that Parliamentarism be replaced by direct government of the people by the people, the abolition of militarism and the creation of a national militia, amnesty, the abolition of appropriations to churches, the resumption of Church property, progressive taxation, the municipalisation and nationalisation of the services of credit, of the supply of provisions, food, work, etc.

"If to these demands in the programme we add those for the abolition of Court fees, for elective and removable magistrates, jury trials in all cases, the obligation of all representatives to follow the instructions of their constituents, free instruction in all schools, complete separation of the civil service and elective offices, taxation upon capital and income, pensions for old age and invalidism, we shall have very nearly all the demands which are formulated in the election programmes of the Socialists.

"The groups differ mainly in the methods they endorse. While the Collectivists would mainly place social organisation in the hands of the State, the Blanquists, Allemanists, and Possibilists have a very marked preference for decentralisation and administration by free communes. The Broussists are distinguished somewhat from the others with respect to this point, namely, that they are less revolutionary, and are willing to form alliances with the established government as a means to accomplish their purposes."

The *Parti Ouvrier Socialiste Révolutionnaire Français* more or less unites all the groups, being divided into sections composed of the Chambers, Syndicates, Co-operative Societies, and Groups and Circles of Socialist propaganda and study. It should be noted that in France almost all the trades unions are Socialists. The programme of the *Parti Ouvrier* declares for the socialisation of all the means of production, to prepare the way for a Communism, to which each will contribute in service according to his ability, and from which he shall receive according to his needs. It declares for the maintenance of a strict class movement of the *Prolétariat*, without any alliance with the Bourgeoisie, since the Socialist ideal can only be realised through a revolution towards which the party moves, striving to gain political control of the communes (municipalities) and the Government. To this end the programme names the following measures :—

A. POLITICAL.

1. All communes to elect their own mayors, and officers, and commissioners.

2. Payment of all members of town councils and officers of the communes.

3. Reference of all important questions, such as those of loans, the budget, etc., to ratification by the popular vote.

4. Publication of all municipal decisions, and buildings belonging to the commune to be given for the use of working men's unions and other groups of electors.

5. Civil and political equality for men and women.

6. Arbitration in judicial matters by arbitrators elected by the commune.

7. Disbanding of the standing army, and general arming of the people.

8. Removal of all officials to be submitted to the local bureau of the working men's party, an assembly of groups alone being allowed to remove.

9. The members of the party to be allowed to accept no position on committees of the town councils, unless the majority of the committee are Socialists.

10. Freedom of coalition and agreement between different communes.

11. Each town councillor to vote against all propositions of senatorial delegates.

B. Economic.

1. No further disposal of communal property, but addition to the communal estate of all property arising from future expropriation.

2. Municipalisation of all public service, such as gasworks, tramways, etc., and their conduct by the communes either free or at net cost.

3. All payments of rent in advance to be forbidden, and a tax of 20 per cent. to be placed upon buildings not rented and lots not occupied.

4. Education of all children given to the communes to maintain.

5. General extension of communal statistical records.

6. Organisation by society of the various forms of insurance and assurance, and maintenance at public expense of all the aged and those too infirm to work.

7. Suppression of private employment bureaux and extension of public labour exchanges (*Bourses du Travail*).

8. Abolition of all city tolls (*octrois*) and all taxes on communes, and their replacement by rapidly progressive taxes on all incomes over 3000 frs. (£120) and all inheritances over 20,000 frs. (£800).

9. Obligatory intervention by the commune in industrial matters: (1) By measures preventing prison labour from competition with free labour; (2) by subsidies given to trades unions on strike; (3) by regulations securing public safety, and forbidding all work at wages less than those fixed by the trades unions.

The programme of the Guesdists or Marxists is :—

A. POLITICAL.

1. Abolition of all laws restricting freedom of the press, of association, and meeting.

2. Abolition of the budget of public worship, and secularisation of ecclesiastical property.

3. Abolition of national debt.

4. Universal military service on the part of the people (in place of standing armies).

5. Communal independence in police and local affairs.

B. ECONOMIC.

1. One day of rest in the week under legal requirement. An eight hours' working day for adults, and a six hours' day for young persons between 14 and 16. Prohibition of work for all under 14.

2. Legal determination of a minimum of wages each year, in accordance with the price of provisions.

3. Equality of wages for men and women.

4. Maintenance and scientific and technical education by the commune of all children.

5. Public support of the aged and infirm.

6. Sole control and management by workers themselves of all funds for the relief of the working classes.

7. Employers' liability guaranteed by deposits from employees.

8. Participation of working men in drawing factory regulations ; abolition of fines in factories, etc.

9. Revision of all agreements by which public property or franchises have been given to private companies (banks, railways, mines, etc.). The management of all State factories by the workmen employed in them.

10. Abolition of all indirect taxes, and in their place a progressive income tax on all incomes above 3000 frs.

11. Abolition of the right of inheritance, except in the line of direct descent, and in the latter of fortunes above 20,000 frs.

The *Broussists*, or Municipalists, demand for the communes control of their own police, soldiers, civil administration, and judiciary. They advocate the municipalisation of the supply of gaslight and water, of local transportation, of bakehouses and granaries and meat-shops. They would have the municipalities (communes) establish productive factories and associations, to be managed by working men.

Such is an outline of French Democratic Socialism. From Anarchism it is now wholly free. The Anarchists attack Socialism as bitterly as Capitalism, and call Socialism "the modern Pope". French Socialists have nothing to do with Anarchism, and call it mistaken folly.

Of Christian Socialism in France we treat in a forthcoming book. It is wholly different from English or American Christian Socialism, really not Socialism at all. Of academic Socialism there is not much in France: what little there is, is referred to in chapter xiii. State Socialism, too, is only slightly developed, although the larger cities, and especially Paris, have a growing municipalism.

Since the suppression of the *Bourse du Travail*, the large building once furnished by the city for the trades unions, Paris has no general Socialist headquarters, although the office of *La Petite République*, 142 Rue Montmartre, is, to some extent, the central point of all the groups. An unofficial *Bourse du Travail* has lately been founded (80 Rue de Bondy) by several of the larger trades unions.

The best books on French Socialism available to the English reader are Laveleye's and Rae's works on *Contemporary Socialism* (latest editions) for the earlier periods, with the appendix to Ely's *Socialism and Social Reform* for the present situation. Malon has a *History of Socialism* (in French) and Jäger (in German). A very good account is contained in Stigman and Hugo's *Handbuch des Socialismus*. For French Socialist newspapers, see Appendix C.

CHAPTER VII.

SOCIALISM IN GERMANY.

GERMAN Socialism begins in philosophy. Hegel, living in the stirring times of the French Revolution and of the Napoleonic Wars, and conceiving of all things, even of God, as an eternal process, early taught that society was a unit, developing from lower to higher unities (the individual, the family, the State, the nation, the world), each unity realising and not destroying the lower unity. It is not hard to see how, with this philosophy, Hegel became the teacher of Marx, Lassalle, Bakunin, and many other Socialists. As early as 1797, he had written a commentary on Sir James Stewart's *Inquiry into the Principles of Political Economy*, but only in 1821 published his *Philosophy of Right.* Meanwhile Fichte, starting from the conception of the Ego, taught that property was the result of the activity of the Ego, and the State the resultant of the union of individual Egos ; but that if any man had not the opportunity to work, he had no necessity for respecting the rights of property, since in his case the State had not fulfilled its implied contract. Labour and distribution, he taught, should be collectively organised, and his State is a utopian commonwealth, organised on the principles of pure reason. His *Naturrecht* was published in 1796, and his *Staatslehre* in 1820. Thus, with Hegel's socialistic philosophy and Fichte's socialistic turning of an individualistic philosophy, coupled with his noble, spiritual, and patriotic life, German philosophy early received a strong socialistic bias.

This, too, was in accord with the German mediæval conception of the Christian paternal state. The house of Brandenburg, and especially Frederick the Great, devoted unusual attention to the economic condition of their territories. It was the proud boast of Frederick the Great that he was "le roi des gueux". He himself established industrial undertakings for the country's good, at one time devoting (1783) 260,000 thalers from his own purse to reform Prussian mining and smelting. The State imported raw material, and sold it to workers at a low price. He established a State-post, and built roads and canals. Asked to sanction a tax on meat and bread, he returned the official document with the note: "I will never agree to make the poor man's bread and meat dearer; I am the advocate of the poor".

The spirit of his successors has been the same. Under Frederick William II., Prussian *prestige*, both politically and commercially, suffered a great blow, but the common law in his reign did more than any prince. This law, begun by the Elector Jahann Georg (1571-1598), was completed by Frederick William II., coming into force, July 1, 1794. The Prussian *Landrecht* discourages idleness, recognises the right of every citizen to work, and proclaims the State to be the natural protector of the poorer classes. It contains the following clauses:—

> 1. It is the duty of the State to provide for the sustenance and support of those of its citizens who cannot . . . procure subsistence themselves.
> 2. Work adapted to their strength and capacities shall be supplied to those who lack means and opportunity of earning a livelihood for themselves and those dependent upon them.
> 3. Those who, from laziness, love of idleness, or other irregular proclivities, do not choose to employ the means offered them of earning a livelihood, shall be kept to useful work by compulsion and punishment under proper control.
> 4. The State is entitled and is bound to take such measures as will prevent the destitution of its citizens and check excessive extravagance.
> 5. The police authority of every place must provide for all poor and destitute persons, whose subsistence cannot be ensured in any other way.

It was upon these clauses that Prince Bismarck relied, when on May 9, 1884, he declared to the Reichstag his recognition of the labourer's "right to work" (*Recht auf Arbeit*).

The philosophic and somewhat paternal Socialism of Hegel and Fichte was thus not alien to the older German political traditions.

Nevertheless, in the early part of the nineteenth century the prevalent political, and especially the prevalent economic, ideas of Germany were individualistic. German statesmen and economists drew their ideas at this time mainly from England and the orthodox economy of Adam Smith. Particularly was this true of the Stein-Hardenberg legislation of Prussia. While appealing to a sense of national unity, it was nevertheless a policy of *laissez faire*. It, however, prepared the way for Democratic Socialism. Germany more than most countries of Europe, perhaps because of the lack of a strong centralised power to break the power of the old guilds and free cities, was in the control of innumerable special privileges, rights and monopolies, granted to the old guilds and corporations. Her industrial life was fettered by a thousand imposts and tolls and tariffs at the boundary of every petty State. This mass of special privileges and imposts had to be done away with by the free trade policy and the *laissez faire* philosophy of the Stein legislation.

It was similar in its results to the work of the French Revolution. It accomplished changes of the same kind and comparable in extent, though by a perfectly regular process. In Bavaria a movement towards social reform was made as early as 1808, when serfage was abolished, and the agrarian laws in general were softened.

Nevertheless, by no means all was accomplished. After Stein and Hardenberg, a period of reaction followed. The old police *régime* was continued, the printing press was subjected to stringent control, and popular liberty was gradually hemmed into the old limits; the ancient absolute State was, in fact, revived. In some places the press censorship was so severe that even visiting cards could not be printed until the signature of the censor had been obtained.

Such was the condition of things in Germany when the revolutions of 1848 awoke Europe. A socialistic philosophy, an individualistic political economy, the traditions of a paternal State, and a spirit of democracy and of revolution in the younger minds,—such were the influences out of which has come German Socialism.

Even previous to the revolution of 1848, there were a few voices for Socialism in Germany. Heinrich Gall in 1819 gave up an official position to battle for Socialism. Wilhelm Weitling, often called the Father of German Communism (Socialism), had, before his removal to America in 1848, travelled all over Germany and into France preaching Communism. Declaring that he had been converted to Communism by the reading of the New Testament, his Socialism was of the utopian type of Fourier and Cabet. Karl Grun, like Marx and Lassalle, a Hegelian, had in 1842 become editor of a Mannheim journal, and advocated Socialist ideas. As early as 1838, Frederick Wilhelm IV. had invited Huber to Berlin to publish the *Janus*, a Christian State Socialistic paper, which chiefly advocated co-operation. The main early voices for Socialism were the young Hegelians.

In 1842, Marx had become editor of the *Rheinische Zeitung* at Cologne, and had edited it so radically that it was suppressed in 1843, when he had gone to Paris, to find Engels and other Socialists there, and to there edit a paper till he was expelled in 1845. Going with Engels to Brussels, he came in 1847 into correspondence with some Communists in London, and founded there a Communist League. By the authorisation of this league, early in 1848, he and Engels published from Brussels a Manifesto of "The Communist Party," which became the first formal utterance of modern Socialism.

There was one more important voice for Socialism in Germany prior to 1848. Karl Rodbertus, or Jagetzow, as he is called from his estates in Pomerania, took little active part in the direct Socialist movement; but many, like Wagner, the distinguished State Socialist of Germany, declare Rodbertus to be the first, the most original, and the boldest representative of scientific Socialism. Born at Griefswald, in Old Swedish Pomerania, he held various professorial and political positions, but never held them long, owing to his Radical views. He declined an offer of nobility, yet signed himself Rodbertus Jagetzow. At first a democrat, he was in the latter part of his life able to support much of Prince Bismarck's State Socialism. He held that all wealth is the result of labour, and that since the capitalist class, as capitalists, did not labour, they won their livelihood by the labour of others. He developed with much acumen the theory of surplus labour, which Marx later more brilliantly, but less substantially, enunciated. His cure was State ownership of land and capital; and since all wealth was the result of labour, the recognition of labour-time as the equitable basis of exchange value. He sought this not through revolution, but evolution, the development of a strong executive power, in a State Socialism. Rodbertus was eminently a student; and when Lassalle wrote him urging him to assist in the actual movement for Socialism, Rodbertus was unable to see his way to combine economics and agitation. His chief work was published in 1842.

Such were the influences for Socialism that existed in Germany prior to 1848, when the revolutions burst upon Europe.

THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT.

In Prussia the demand in 1848 was for constitutional government, freedom of religion and of the press, the right of coalition, etc., with demands here and there by the *Prolétariat* for the organisation of labour, State employment of the unemployed, etc. In Berlin blood was shed. The king, Frederick William IV., promised reforms and the reorganisation of Germany. Berlin continued in a state of tumult for several months. At Constance a German Republic was proclaimed, but was easily put down by the government troops. Similar uprisings occurred at Freiburg, Dresden, and in other places. The National Assembly was called at Frankfort, where Bismarck won his first laurels in gaining the leadership of Prussia.

The effect of the revolution upon the social movement was twofold. First, it freed the working man, by giving him political power in the new constitutions that were proclaimed. Second, it called out the Socialist leaders. Marx came from Brussels and advocated Socialism in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* till he was finally expelled from the country in 1849, the last number of the paper appearing in red ink. Lassalle, at Düsseldorf, called upon the citizens to arm to resist the illegal dissolution of the National Assembly. He was accused of treason, and sentenced to imprisonment for three months. Bakunin took a prominent part in the Dresden insurrection.

But the time for Socialist organisation was not yet. The only industrial organisations effected immediately after the revolution were various clubs, mainly under the patronage of the Liberal party, and the co-operative land banks and societies, organised by Schulze-Delitzsch. In Berlin, however, Lassalle's utterances were growing more radical; and on April 12, 1862, sometimes called the birthday of German Socialism, being invited to lecture before a working man's club, he argued that the revolution of 1848 had politically freed the Fourth Estate, even as the French Revolution freed the Third Estate, and that henceforth working men must organise for industrial freedom. He was arrested, and sentenced to imprisonment, which was later commuted to a fine. A central committee of working men's clubs in Leipsic now wrote Lassalle calling on him to outline a policy; and he did so in an *Open Letter*, which has been called the charter of German Socialism. He was next invited to appear, together with Schulze-Delitzsch, before the Leipsic workmen, both to advocate their respective plans. He did so, and carried the meeting by a vote of 1300 to 7. Addressing a meeting at Frankfort, he defeated the followers of Schulze-Delitzsch by a vote of 400 to 41.

Encouraged by these successes, Lassalle now organised at Leipsic, on May 23, 1863, the Universal German Working Man's Association, which was destined to grow into the Social Democratic Party. Lassalle's programme was one of industrial organisation for production with State help. Into this movement Lassalle now put all his energy. The apathy of the working men was his chief obstacle, but he succeeded in rousing them. He made speech after speech, wrote tract after tract, held meeting after meeting. All the time he was fighting the courts in trial after trial, defending himself, and usually winning. Berlin, Leipsic, Frankfort, and the industrial centres on the Rhine were the chief scenes of his activity. His greatest success was on the Rhine, where, in the summer of 1863 and 1864, his travels as missionary of the new Gospel resembled a triumphal procession. He claimed that he had converted the king, Bismarck, and the Bishop of Mayence. Bismarck certainly received this remarkable man into his friendship, a friendship which may be regarded as historic because of its political results.

But Lassalle had now reached the height of his career. Worn out with over-exertions, he went to Switzerland for rest; and there made the love-acquaintance which, through a duel, resulted in his death, August 31, 1864.

But his death in itself worked for Socialism. It created the greatest interest. Heine called him the Messiah of the Nineteenth Century. The people called him the Father of Social Democracy.

Becker, chosen as Lassalle's successor, was a failure; still the work went on, first under Becker and then Schweitzer. Meanwhile, in London, at the end of September, 1864, the famous International Working Men's Association was established, and Marx was made its president. With the principles of this organisation Liebknecht, who had already joined Lassalle's association, and who in time won August Bebel over to his side, was in complete sympathy; and though he continued to profess allegiance to the more moderate proposals of the German Association, he was known to be promoting the influence of the International.

The International stood for the organisation of the people without aid from present State governments. Its end was "the joint action, the advancement, and the complete emancipation of the working class". The unit of the association was the section. Lassalle's association demanded aid from the present State. Neither organisation was so radical as the International later became.

Bebel, originally a follower of Schulze-Delitzsch, and, at the time of his alliance with Liebknecht, president of a Working Men's Association at Leipsic, founded on the principles of Schulze, but transferred to Lassalle, became in the autumn of 1867 president of the Union of Working Men's Associations; and the following year, at the annual congress, was instrumental with Liebknecht in inducing a large majority of the associations to accept the programme of the International.

Liebknecht and Bebel were encouraged to make renewed endeavours to detach Schweitzer's adherents, but for the present they were only slightly successful. In the following year, 1869, however, the Social Democratic Working Men's Party was formed at Eisenach out of the "internationalised" Union of Working Men's Associations and the seceded members of the Universal. A conference was first called for August 7. The congress met, and did all that its promoters expected of it. It is estimated that the 262 delegates who avowed Internationalist principles at this congress represented 150,000 working men, though two-thirds of them belonged to Austria and Switzerland.

The party adopted as its organ the *Volksblatt*, as the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt* was rechristened, and the work of propagandism was eagerly begun. In June, 1870, a second congress was held at Stuttgart. In December, 1870, Liebknecht, Bebel, and Hepner, the responsible editor of the party organ, were arrested for the publication of treasonable writings. They were tried early in 1872, Liebknecht being sent to prison for two years, and Bebel for two years and nine months, while Hepner was released. The anti-national policy pursued in the party camp was also pursued by the Socialists who held seats in the Reichstag. Holding fast to the idea of a Republic, they voted against war grants, and opposed the *Kaiser* and *Reich*. The Reichstag was dissolved in December, and in the succeeding elections the Social Democrats lost ground.

In 1874, however, ten members of the Social Democratic Party, three belonging to the Lassalle and seven to the Eisenach section, were returned to the Reichstag by 450,000 votes. Bebel and Liebknecht were still in prison, but they were nevertheless elected along with Hasenclever, Most, Vahlteich, and others. Socialism was now becoming such a power in the State that the Government determined to be more stringent. House searches were made in great number, and when Hasenclever, the president, removed to Bremen, the association was declared by the police to be dissolved in Prussia under the Association Law of 1850, which forbade the combination of political organisations. The Social Democratic Working Men's Party shared the same fate, and nearly all the trades associations which had been formed by Schweitzer came likewise beneath the ban of the law. Misfortune brought the two rival parties together, and negotiations for the drawing up of a common programme were entered into by Liebknecht and Geib for the Social Democrats, and Hasenclever and his henchman, Hasselmann, for the Lassalle party. Liebknecht's endeavours were at last crowned with success: the German Socialists were united in one body. A congress held at Gotha in May, 1875, completed the union. At this meeting 9000 members of the Eisenach party (representing 144 places) and 15,000 members of the Lassalle party (representing 148 places) were represented, the number of the delegates being 125. The programme then adopted became the basis of the great agitation which followed and extended to all parts of Germany.

Such is the account of the founding of the Social Democratic Party, the last details of which we have abridged from Dawson's *German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle.* The Gotha programme is as follows:—

> 1. Labour is the source of all wealth and all culture, and as useful work in general is possible only through society, so to society—that is, to all its members—belongs the entire product of labour by an equal right, to each one according to his reasonable wants,—all being bound to work.
>
> In the existing society the instruments of labour are a monopoly of the capitalist class; the subjection of the working class thus arising is the cause of misery and servitude in every form.
>
> The emancipation of the working class demands the transformation of the instruments of labour into the common property of society and the co-operative control of the total labour, with application of the product of labour to the common good, and just distribution of the same.

The emancipation of labour must be the work of the labouring class, in contrast to which all other classes are only a reactionary mass.

2. Proceeding from these principles, the Socialistic working men's party of Germany aims by all legal means at the establishment of the free State and the Socialistic society, to destroy the iron law of wages by abolishing the system of wage-labour, to put a term to exploitation in every form, to remove all social and political inequality.

The Socialistic working men's party of Germany, though working first of all within the national limits, is conscious of the international character of the labour movement, and resolved to fulfil all duties which this imposes on the workmen, in order to realise the universal brotherhood of men.

In order to prepare the way for the solution of the social question, the Socialistic working men's party of Germany demands the establishment of Socialistic productive associations with State help under the democratic control of the labouring people. The productive associations are to be founded on such a scale both for industry and agriculture that out of them may develop the Socialistic organisation of the total labour.

The Socialistic working men's party demands as bases of the State—(1) universal, equal, and direct right of electing and voting, with secret and obligatory voting, of all citizens from twenty years of age for all elections and deliberations in the State and local bodies; the day of election or voting must be a Sunday or holiday; (2) direct legislation by the people; questions of war and peace to be decided by the people; (3) universal military duty; a people's army in place of the standing armies; (4) abolition of all exceptional laws, especially as regards the press, unions, and meetings, and generally of all laws which restrict freedom of thought and inquiry; (5) administration of justice by the people; free justice; (6) universal and equal education by the State; compulsory education; free education in all public places of instruction; religion declared to be a private concern.

Within the existing society the Socialistic working men's party of Germany demands—(1) greatest possible extension of political rights and liberties in the sense of the above demands; (2) a single progressive income tax for State and local purposes, instead of the existing taxes, and especially of the indirect taxes that oppress the people; (3) unrestricted right of combination; (4) a normal working day corresponding to the needs of society; prohibition of Sunday labour; (5) prohibition of labour of children, and of all women's work injurious to health and morality; (6) laws for the protection of the life and health of workmen; sanitary control of workmen's dwellings; inspection of mines, factories, workshops, and house labour by officials chosen by the workmen; an effective Employers' Liability Act; (7) regulation of prison labour; (8) workmen's funds to be under the entire control of the workmen.

We now come to the era of the attempted repression of Democratic Socialism by Bismarck, an account which again we condense from the full account by Dawson: "On May 11, 1878, while driving in the Linden, in Berlin, with his daughter, the Grand Duchess of Baden, the Emperor William was shot at by a young man named Hödel, an ignorant fellow of low character. Two shots were fired from a pistol, but both failed to take effect. The nation was horrified, and two days later an Anti-Socialist Bill was introduced in the Reichstag. The conviction was widely shared that Hödel, who three months later suffered death at Berlin, was an instrument of the Social Democratic party; and natural conclusions were drawn from the fact that when captured photographs of Liebknecht, Bebel, and other prominent Socialist leaders were found on his person."

The Socialist deputies denounced the proposals as "an unexampled attempt on popular freedom," and the Government was defeated. No sooner had the Reichstag refused to pass the law than another attempt was made upon the life of the aged sovereign. This time the would-be assassin was a Dr. Karl Nobiling, who on June 2, 1878, fired at the emperor from an upper window in the Linden and severely wounded him. The cry for repressive measures against the Socialists became general.

Another law was now proposed—the "Law against the publicly-dangerous endeavours of Social Democracy". The bill as introduced consisted of twenty-two clauses, and as approved it gave to the executive and the police very extensive powers. The *Begründung* set forth the reason as being that "Social Democracy has declared war against the State and society, and has proclaimed their subversion to be its aim. It has thus forsaken the ground of equal right for all, and it cannot complain if the law should only be exercised in its favour to the extent consistent with the security and order of the State."

The debate which took place on the bill was one of historical importance, for Prince Bismarck expounded his economic and social views with a freedom and candour which astonished many, and paved the way for an open avowal of the policy of State

Socialism. The debate lasted two long days. The Socialist party endeavoured to clear itself of complicity in the two attempts on the emperor; but it was answered that even although Hödel and Nobiling might not have been the emissaries of the party, the very essence of Socialism and Communism was hatred of the ruling classes. Bebel declared:—

"We wish to abolish the present form of private property in the instruments of production and means of labour, as well as in land. That is a fact which we have never denied. But so far Social Democracy has never forcibly taken or destroyed private property to the value of a nickel—*Fünfer* [5 *Pfennig*, or about ½d.], nor does it wish to attack private property with the intention of ruining the individuals."

On this ground he opposed a bill that proposed to attack the legally-acquired property of Socialists and their sympathisers by the confiscation of newspapers and publications. He twitted Prince Bismarck for associating with Socialists like Lassalle, an act which could only serve to confirm the working classes in the belief that their Socialistic convictions were right, and instanced Rodbertus, Von Thünen, Rau, Lange, Schäffle, Roscher, Wagner, Samter, Von Scheel, Brentano, and Schmoller as political economists more or less Socialistic.

The bill became law on October 19—after Liebknecht had declared that it could "neither be made better nor worse," and the Progressist leader, Richter, had said: "I fear Social Democracy more under this law than without it," and on the 21st it was promulgated. The division showed 221 members to be in favour of the measure, and 149 against it.

The law prohibited the formation or existence of organisations which seek by Social Democratic, Socialistic, or Communistic movements to subvert the present State and society. The prohibition also extended to organisations exhibiting tendencies which threaten to endanger the public peace and amity between classes.

Henceforth the Socialistic propaganda was carried on in secret, but more successfully than ever; and in the Reichstag the Socialists were free. Here, at any rate, the pursued Socialist knew that he could claim the right of sanctuary. The Socialist deputies did not hesitate to say that when they spoke it was not with a view or a desire to convince their listeners, but to reach the ears of the outside world. The publication of Parliamentary reports being privileged, journals with Socialistic tendencies were able to reproduce in full the speeches in which Bebel, Liebknecht, and their fellows preached the principles of a movement which the Government had just been given a commission to suppress.

There was only one way of meeting this new danger, and it was by voting to suppress the publicity of proceedings. This Bismarck attempted twice, but each time was defeated.

Agitation increased rapidly. The existence of a group of men disposed to violence was especially made clear at a secret conference held in September, 1879, at Wahren, near Leipsic. Here Most and Hasselmann were all for force. Hasselmann advised revolution outright. He acknowledged the certainty of failure, yet he argued that the blood that would be shed would help on the cause. Most, who early in 1879 established the *Freiheit* in London, with the motto: "All measures are legitimate against tyrants," advocated murder, outrage, and rapine. The Social Democratic party, however, drew back. It was proposed to hold a congress in June of the following year at Rorschach, in Switzerland, but it was at the last moment postponed, on it becoming known that Most and Hasselmann intended to be present and to endeavour to force a revolutionary programme on the party. An important congress was, however, held at Wyden, near Ossingen, in Switzerland, on August 20-23, and fifty delegates were present from Germany, but neither Most nor Hasselmann appeared. It was found that the adherents of these men were a strong body, and the congress became divided into Government and Opposition. The principal result of the Wyden congress was the severing of the revolutionary limb from the Socialistic body. Most and Hasselmann were rejected, and Bebel and Liebknecht were adhered to. But while the Socialist party was thus voting, its now official organ, the *Social Democrat*, was declaring that "only by a violent subversion can the Democratic State be attained".

Indeed, the manifesto issued just after the congress belied the assumed attitude of passive resistance.

On March 13, 1881, the Emperor Alexander II. of Russia was assassinated by Nihilists; and a few days later the German Emperor wrote to his faithful Chancellor, urging him to lose no time in bringing before the Governments of Europe the necessity of combining against the forces of anarchy and destruction. Bismarck commenced international correspondence; but it came to nothing, largely through the opposition of Great Britain. Bismarck took refuge in a further carrying out of paternal Socialism, which we shall consider in a moment.

On the other hand, an event occurred during this year which roused the authorities to increased vigilance. This was the Niederwald plot against the Imperial family, the existence of which was discovered in September. Various arrests were made, and the trial took place at Leipsic, two men, avowedly Anarchists, being in December, 1884, sentenced to death. In the early part of this latter year the Socialist Law was prolonged for two years, until September 30, 1886, and the Government succeeded, on May 15, in passing a law against the "criminal and publicly-dangerous use of explosives," a measure which received general support. As before, Berlin, Leipsic, Hamburg, and other places were in a minor state of siege; but although the local authorities thus acquired greatly increased powers, it was impossible to check the movements of the enemy. Bebel was perhaps right when he declared in the Reichstag, on March 20, that the Socialist party was nowhere more numerous or better organised than in the districts where the minor state of siege had been proclaimed, and that the party press had never been more serviceable than then, for though the *Social Democrat* was published abroad, its circulation was far larger than before the passing of the coercive measures, and it was now able to furnish the agitation with considerable funds. Bebel said: "The fathers of the Socialist Law are also the fathers of Anarchism in Germany".

In 1884 another general election took place, and it afforded the Socialist party an opportunity of demonstrating a strength which no one had believed to exist. The campaign was entered upon with extraordinary vigour, and the result was that, in spite of all the difficulties incidental to the vigilant enforcement of the Socialist Law, no fewer than twenty-four seats were won, or double the number of 1881. Ten seats were won in Prussia, five in Saxony, two in Bavaria, one in Hesse, and six in minor States.

In Berlin two out of the six places fell to Socialists, and in Hamburg and Breslau two out of three. The number of votes polled was 549,990.

Repression was made more vigorous than ever. In July, 1885, a sensational Socialist trial took place at Freiberg, when nine Socialists, including the six deputies, Bebel, Von Vollmar, Dietz, Auer, Frohme, and Viereck, were charged with taking part in a secret and illegal organisation. The result of the trial was that all the accused were sentenced to imprisonment for six or nine months, Bebel and four Parliamentary associates receiving the heavier penalty. Several of the deputies were reported on their release to have suffered severely from incarceration.

In February, 1887, the Reichstag was dissolved on the Army Bill, which it refused to accept, and the patriotic spirit aroused led to a reaction similar to that of 1878.

In 1888, owing to the successive changes after the death of the old emperor, and the wonder as to what position the young emperor, and then the present emperor, would take, there was no marked change in the Socialist situation. The year 1889 was marked by the largest strike Germany had ever known, which took place in the coal mines of Westphalia and the Rhenish provinces, and threatened to spread, and did spread, more or less through the empire, the emperor himself taking an interest in hearing the complaints of the miners and ordering an investigation. The strike ended after not many weeks' duration in the substantial victory of the men, although to some extent they compromised. These years were also attended by constant struggles in the Reichstag and the press over the Anti-Socialist Law, its renewal or modification, and also by constant trials of Socialists, sometimes many being tried and banished at a time.

On March 20, 1890, the emperor accepted the resignation of Bismarck as Chancellor, largely upon Bismarck's insistence that the Anti-Socialist Law must be renewed, a step which the young emperor did not favour; and on its expiration, September 30, 1890, it was not renewed. The Socialists came back in great numbers, amid general rejoicing. Herr Liebknecht assumed the editorship of the *Volksblatt*, and activity went on more rapidly than ever.

On October 12 a general convention was held at Halle, 360 delegates being present. It reaffirmed the Gotha programme of 1875, as modified by the subsequent congress at Wyden. The Socialist conference at Erfurt in 1891 was marked by a conflict between Wildburger and Werner with their followers on the one hand advocating a more revolutionary following, and Bebel, Liebknecht, Vollmar, and their followers on the other advocating the present political agitation. The latter won, and still rule the movement in Germany, although the more revolutionary wing is not weak, and threatens at times to divide the party. Nevertheless, the party goes on propagating its views very rapidly, especially in Berlin, Hamburg, and the great industrial centres, and not least in the army, where young men, restless under conscription, are gathered from all Germany, and ready therefore, under the galling yoke of the army service, which is so hated by the working class, to listen to Socialism; so much so indeed that some Socialists have gone so far as to favour the standing army as at present as the best school for Socialism. The conflict of the year 1893 over the Standing Army Bill is well known, with its result of the stupendous Socialistic gains. The following table shows the growth of the Social Democratic party since the founding of the German Empire, as shown in the imperial election returns, taken from Braun's *Die Parteien des Deutschen Reichstages*, Stuttgart, 1893:—

Election in	Total Number of Social Democratic Votes.	Percentage of Votes of Social Democratic Party.	Members Elected.	Votes Cast for each Member.
1871	124,655	3·	2	62,327
1874	351,952	6·8	9	39,106
1877	493,288	9·1	12	41,107
1878	437,158	7·6	9	48,573
1881	311,961	6·1	12	25,997
1884	549,990	9·7	24	22,916
1887	763,128	10·1	11	69,375
1890	1,427,298	19·7	35*	40,780
1893	1,876,738	23·3	44	40,608

* In the bye-election in the twenty-second district of Saxony, held in 1892, the thirty-sixth member was elected.

The following are the present demands of the German Social Democratic party according to the Erfurt programme adopted in October, 1891 :—

1. Universal, equal, and direct suffrage by ballot, in all elections, for all subjects of the empire over twenty years of age, without distinction of sex. Proportional representation, and, until this system has been introduced, fresh division of electoral districts by law after each census. Two years' duration of the legislature. Holding of elections on a legal day of rest. Payment of the representatives elected. Removal of all restrictions upon political rights, except in the case of persons under age.

2. Direct legislation by the people by means of the right of initiative and of veto. Self-government by the people in empire, state, province, and commune. Election of magistrates by the people, with the right of holding them responsible. Annual vote of the taxes.

3. Universal military education. Substitution of militia for a standing army. Decision by the popular representatives of questions of peace and war. Decisions of all international disputes by arbitration.

4. Abolition of all laws which restrict or suppress free expression of opinion and the right of meeting or association.

5. Abolition of all laws which place the woman, whether in a private or a public capacity, at a disadvantage as compared with the man.

6. Declaration that religion is a private matter. Abolition of all expenditure from public funds upon ecclesiastical and religious objects. Ecclesiastical and religious bodies are to be regarded as private associations which order their affairs independently.

7. Secularisation of education. Compulsory attendance at public

national schools. Free education, free supply of educational apparatus, and free maintenance to children in schools, and to such pupils, male and female, in higher educational institutions, as are judged to be fitted for further education.

8. Free administration of the law and free legal assistance. Administration of the law by judges elected by the people. Appeal in criminal cases. Compensation to persons accused, imprisoned, or condemned unjustly. Abolition of capital punishment.

9. Free medical assistance, and free supply of remedies. Free burial of the dead.

10. Graduated income and property tax to meet all public expenses, which are to be met by taxation. Self-assessment. Succession duties, graduated according to the extent of the inheritance and the degree of relationship. Abolition of all indirect taxation, custom duties, and other economic measures, which sacrifice the interests of the community to the interests of a privileged minority.

For the protection of labour, the German Social Democrats also demand to begin with :—

1. An effective national and international system of protective legislation on the following principles :—
    - (*a*) The fixing of a normal working day, which shall not exceed eight hours.
    - (*b*) Prohibition of the employment of children under fourteen.
    - (*c*) Prohibition of night work, except in those branches of industry which, from their nature and for technical reasons or for reasons of public welfare, require night work.
    - (*d*) An unbroken rest of at least thirty-six hours for every workman every week.
    - (*e*) Prohibition of the truck system.
2. Supervision of all industrial establishments, together with the investigation and regulation of the conditions of labour in the town and country by an imperial labour department, district labour bureaux, and chambers of labour. A thorough system of industrial sanitary regulation.
3. Legal equality of agricultural labourers and domestic servants with industrial labourers ; repeal of the laws concerning masters and servants.
4. Confirmation of the rights of association.
5. The taking over by the imperial Government of the whole system of workmen's insurance, though giving the workmen a certain share in its administration.

The party is strongly organised, and carries on a most active propaganda, publishing thirty-one daily newspapers, forty-one weeklies and semi-weeklies, one scientific review, one family magazine, two humorous publications, fifty-five trade journals.

At present it is making strong efforts to extend itself in the agricultural districts. It has organised night schools for the education and training of Socialist speakers. It has many adherents among the university students. These students held a meeting to discuss their plans for pushing Social Democracy in Geneva and Switzerland in December, 1893.

Such is the account of German Democratic Socialism; but there have been in Germany four other separate movements, all using the name Socialism. The earliest of these is the Roman Catholic German Christian Socialist movement, mainly led by Bishop Ketteler in Mayence about 1850, and still a strong political and social force in the empire. It often allies itself politically with the Social Democrats, but proceeds on wholly different lines. German Social Democracy is avowedly atheistic and materialistic, and will have naught to do with the Church. The Roman Catholic movement, too, favours a paternal State Socialism, under churchly guidance, rather than a fraternal democracy. This is even more true of the German Protestant Christian Socialism which sprang up under Stöcker, the court preacher in Berlin, about 1877. It organised two societies, one to reach the wealthy and one the working men, and is almost explicitly the Church wing of the Government's paternal State Socialism. An account of both of these movements will be found in our book to appear on *Christian Socialism.*

The third movement in Germany using the name Socialism is that of the so-called Socialists of the Chair (*Katheder Sozialisten*), for an account of which see chapter xiii. ("Socialism and the Political Economists").

The fourth movement which uses the name of Socialism in Germany is the State Socialism of the Government itself.

As early as 1847 Bismarck had spoken in favour of State railroads; but he did not definitely, or at least publicly, adopt the principles of State Socialism till 1878, after the policy of repression of the Democratic Socialists had begun. He then endeavoured with the one hand to repress and with the other to take the ground from under them. His first step, however, was simply to reverse the economic policy of the State on the subject of taxation. Up to 1876 Bismarck had entrusted the country's economic policy entirely to Minister von Deltrüch, but in that year he resigned, and within two years the Ministers of Finance, of Commerce, and the Interior followed suit. Various causes were given, but the real reason was that they found themselves no longer in accord with the Chancellor. In 1879 Bismarck openly declared for Protection. But this was the least distinctive feature of the new policy. On February 26, 1878, speaking on a bill for the increase of tobacco duties, Bismarck said bluntly: "I do not deny and do not regard it as superfluous . . . to avow openly that I am aiming at a monopoly, and that I only accept this measure as transitional". From that day to this the Reichstag has grown familiar with State Socialism. Accused of advocating Socialism, he did not deny it; but said: "Many measures which we have adopted to the great blessing of the country are Socialistic, and the State will have to accustom itself to a little more Socialism yet. . . . If you believe that you can frighten any one or call up spectres with the word 'Socialism,' you take a standpoint which I abandoned long ago, and the abandonment of which is absolutely necessary for our entire imperial legislation." His reasons, however, were financial, not doctrinaire. He believed that it would pay. In February, 1880, he convened the Prussian Economic Council (*Volkswirthschaftsrath*)—a body established in November, 1880, for the purpose of assisting him in the deliberation of measures affecting trade, industry, agriculture and forestry—and laid before it a full-fledged Tobacco Monopoly Bill. The Economic Council decided in favour of the Government's proposals, and the next step was the mention of the monopoly in an imperial message of November 14, 1881.

The Prussian Economic Council is itself a Socialistic feature, consisting as it does of seventy-five members, of whom forty-five are recommended to the Government for nomination by representatives of trade, industry, and agriculture and forestry (fifteen members each); while thirty are called by the Government, fifteen at least of these representing the artisan and labour classes. Election is for five years.

The promised measure was introduced in the Reichstag the following spring.

Bismarck was overwhelmingly defeated, and, though he has tried again more than once, has not succeeded; and the same is true of his efforts to introduce a State monopoly of the trade in brandy. In other lines, however, his State Socialism has been far more successful.

As early as 1847 Bismarck spoke in the United Diet, which met in Berlin, in favour of a closer connection between the railroads and the State. The annexation of Alsace-Lorraine gave to Germany the nucleus of an imperial railway system, but the uniform administration of the lines in the recovered province only served to throw into greater relief the utter chaos which prevailed in the rest of Germany. The railways were of half a dozen kinds. There were, first, the imperial railways. Then there were the State railways pure and simple. There were private lines in private hands, and private lines managed by the State, and Bismarck spoke impatiently of "the sixty-three railway provinces". According to the imperial constitution, however, of April 16, 1871, very considerable rights were given to the empire in railway supervision. On June 16, 1873, an Imperial Railway Board Bill was passed, creating an Imperial Railway Board with still greater powers. Tentative measures, however, did little good, and Bismarck determined to adopt heroic measures. He proposed that the States should hand over their railways to the empire, and that Prussia should lead in doing this. On April 16, 1876, the first reading of a bill to this effect took place, and though unmercifully attacked by the Radicals, was carried. Yet, unfortunately, the empire has not seen fit to relieve Prussia of her railways. The real result of the bill was to cause Prussia to extend its purchases of private lines. The result of the various transactions has been to place in the Prussian Treasury millions of marks which otherwise would have gone into the pockets of shareholders, and the taxation of the country has been alleviated to some extent as a consequence.

At present, in Germany, out of 26,971 miles of railway only 3123 belong to private companies, of these 296 were worked by the Government (State or Imperial). But thus far the high-water tide of Imperial State Socialism has been reached in the various State Insurance Laws. In 1881 came the first decided word from the emperor and his Government upon the subject. The speech from the throne which opened the Reichstag on February 15, 1881, said:—

"At the opening of the Reichstag in February, 1879, the emperor, in reference to the [Anti-Socialist] Law of October 21, 1878, gave expression to the hope that this House would not refuse its co-operation in the remedying of social ills by means of legislation. A remedy cannot alone be sought in the repression of Socialistic excesses; there must be simultaneously the positive advancement of the welfare of the working classes. And here the care of those workpeople who are incapable of earning their livelihood is of the first importance. In the interest of these the emperor has caused a bill for the insurance of workpeople against the consequences of accident to be sent to the Bundesrath—a bill which, it is hoped, will meet a need felt both by workpeople and employers. His Majesty hopes that the measure will in principle receive the assent of the Federal Governments, and that it will be welcomed by the Reichstag as a complement of the legislation affording protection against Social Democratic movements."

We will not dwell upon the history of the legislation. The first bills were defeated. Bismarck finally withdrew the plan of State bureaux for insurance, and substituted compulsory insurance in some company, private or State, but strictly regulated by the State. Speaking of it he said: "The whole matter centres in the question, Is it the duty of the State, or is it not, to provide for its helpless citizens? I maintain that it is its duty, that it is the duty not only of the '*Christian* State,' as I ventured once to call it when speaking of 'practical Christianity,' but of every State." The Chancellor spoke on the second reading, proclaiming the working man's "right to labour" (*Recht auf Arbeit*), as laid down in the common law of Prussia. He held that the State was ultimately responsible for the employment of those of its citizens who, through no fault of their own, lacked the opportunity to work. The law covers three points, adopted at different times—Compulsory Sickness, Accident, and Old Age Insurance.

The following account of them is abridged from the statement prepared by the Imperial Insurance Department in Berlin for the Chicago Exposition :—

The Sickness Insurance.—The first of the social-political enactments was the Sick Insurance Law of June 15, 1883, which regulated the reform of sick relief in its relation to the insurance against accidents. For these two branches of insurance supplement each other, and—quite unlike mere poor-law relief, which aims only at upholding the existence of the individual—are designed to provide relief in case of sickness or accidents, and to compensate for lost wages during the time of disability to work. The foundation and first condition of compulsory insurance is dependency on an employer, so that persons carrying on a business of their own are generally exempted. But the law concedes to all exempted workmen and officials, as well as to servants, the right to participate voluntarily in the benefits of the insurance.

The supplemental measure of April 10, 1892 (taking effect January 1, 1893), with the intention of bringing the Sick Insurance Law into harmony with the other insurance laws (against Accidents, Invalidity, and Old Age), which in the meantime had received the sanction of the Government, has widened still further the range of insured persons. Thus persons engaged for wages or salary in commercial firms, in the offices of attorneys, notaries, bailiffs, sick clubs, trades associations, and insurance institutions were made liable to the general, and agricultural officials to the communal (township) compulsory insurance. Furthermore, all the exempted, whose yearly earnings do not exceed 2000 marks, were admitted to the communal voluntary insurance.

As regards the mode of carrying out the insurance, the fundamental aim and object of the law is mutual insurance based on self-administration. The insured are to be classed in corporate associations whose members belong to the same trade or calling, where the risk of sickness is about alike. This organisation greatly facilitates self-administration, and while it exercises a healthy and moral influence on the members in their intercourse with one another, it will make simulation more difficult and the indispensable control easier and more effectual.

The obligation to insure his workpeople lies with the employer, who pays the whole of the premiums in the first instance, but deducts the workpeople's share from their wages.

The minimum of relief to which all the insured have a legal claim includes:—

1. Free medical attendance and medicines from the beginning of the illness, likewise spectacles, trusses, bandages, etc.

2. In case of incapacity for work, from the third day of the illness, for every working day a sick pay, amounting to one half the daily wages on which the contributions have been based; and much more in special cases.

The further extension of the German National Sick Insurance to agricultural labourers and to servants is not yet realised, but even now there are insured about 8,000,000 persons, and upwards of 100,000,000 marks annually are expended in Germany for sick relief alone.

The Accident Insurance.—As with sickness, so in the case of industrial accidents the previous legislation proved inadequate to secure an indemnity to the workman. The first Accident Insurance Law of July 6, 1884, dealt chiefly with industrial enterprises, but served as the basis for subsequent measures with a wider range.

This law makes insurance compulsory for workmen and officials (with salaries up to 2000 marks per annum), in all industries already liable to damages in cases of accident, and, furthermore, where the production is carried on by hand with the aid of machinery, and likewise for some branches of the building trade. By statutory regulations the obligatory insurance may be made to include industrial officials with salaries above 2000 marks, and the privilege of joining the insurance may be granted to the employers.

The insurance is carried out under the guarantee of the empire, on the mutual system, by the employers united in trades associations, which may embrace the different branches of industry in certain districts, or in the whole empire.

These trades associations enjoy the character of legal persons and a perfect self-administration, which they may decentralise by forming "sections" and by appointing "confidential agents".

The object of the insurance is to secure compensation for bodily injury or for death, in consequence of an accident to the workman whilst working for his employer, injuries sustained on other occasions being excluded. As a matter of course, the injured man must not have brought about the accident purposely. The compensation includes the cost of the cure, and in addition, a fixed allowance during the period of incapacity for work, or in fatal cases burial money and an allowance to the survivors (widows, children, parents) from the day of death. When the injured person is totally disabled, the compensation amounts to two-thirds of his average year's earnings; if only partially incapacitated for work, a fraction of this amount—for survivors also—will be granted. For the first thirteen weeks after the accident (the so-called waiting time), the Sick Association, or in their absence the employers have to step in; and from the beginning of the fifth week the sick pay is to be raised, at the cost of the employer, to at least two-thirds of the standard wages.

The amount of the compensation is fixed, after a police investigation, by the organs of that trades association in whose district the accident happened. Against this decision an appeal may be made to an Arbitration Court, composed of two members of the trades association, two representatives of the insured workmen, and a presiding magistrate. This court is invested with the character of a special court of law.

The imperial insurance department is the supreme court for all that has reference to organisation, administration, and judicature. It is composed of permanent members — a president appointed for life by the emperor on recommendation of the Federal Council, and several higher officers similarly appointed—and of temporary members, namely: four delegates to the Federal Council, and representatives of the employers and employed in equal numbers.

The operation of the law has been widened almost each year by being applied to class after class, and will shortly be completed by its extension to handicrafts and small trades, to home industry and commerce, with about 1,000,000 concerns and 2,000,000 employed; so that all the workmen on wages, and the other classes of similar standing with not more than 2000 marks a year, such as industrial and agricultural managers, commercial clerks and small employers, will reap the benefits.

The Invalidity and Old Age Insurance is intended to secure to persons employed for wages or salary a legal provision in cases not covered by the Sickness and Accident Insurance Laws. The Invalidity and Old Age Insurance Law of June 22, 1889, subjects to compulsory insurance (from the completed sixteenth year of age) (1) all persons working for wages in every branch of trade, apprentices and servants included; (2) managing officials and commercial assistants (clerks and apprentices) with regular year's earnings up to 2000 marks. The obligation to insure may also be extended (by order of the Federal Council) (3) to small masters (with only one assistant workman), and (4) to so-called home-industrials (irrespective of the number of hands employed); otherwise these small employers are allowed to join voluntarily the insurance. Such persons, however, as have either given up or for a time laid aside an occupation involving compulsory insurance, possess the right to continue or renew the insurance by paying voluntary contributions.

The pension for old age will be granted, without proof of disability, to all who have completed their seventieth year. It forms an addition to the earnings of old, but not incapacitated working people, and makes some amends for the diminished vigour of age. The waiting time here comprises thirty contributory years, so that for 30 × 47, or for 1410 weeks contributions must have been paid before the insured can enter upon the enjoyment of the pension.

Attested periods of illness, and military service, as well as other interruptions in regular employments (up to four months), will be reckoned in the waiting time for both annuities.

The money to pay the invalidity and old age pensions is furnished jointly by the empire, the employers, and the employed. The empire contributes to each annuity the fixed amount of fifty marks per annum, and pays the contributions of the workmen while serving in the army or navy. It defrays the expenses also of the imperial insurance department, and effects gratuitously, as in the case of the accident insurance, the payment of pensions through the post offices. All other expenses are borne in equal shares by the insured and their employers, and are raised by current contributions. As a rule, the payment of the contributions is to be made by the employer, who, after purchasing stamps (resembling postage stamps) of the respective local insurance office, affixes them (to the amount of the contribution due) to the receipt-card of the insured. These stamps may be had at all the post offices, and at numerous private shops. The contributions are to be paid for each calendar week in which the insured finds himself in an employment or service subject to the insurance (" contributory week," " weekly contribution ").

The carrying out of the invalidity and old age insurance is entrusted, under State guarantee, to special insurance institutions, whose districts coincide with the communal or State divisions. Every insurance institution possesses the character of a legal person, and is managed on the basis of a statute drawn up by the managing " committee ". This committee is composed of at least five representatives of both employers and insured (chosen by the directing boards of the sick-relief clubs and similarly constituted bodies).

As regards the results of the invalidity and old age insurance, in the first year (1891) no less than 132,917 annuities have been granted, 15,306,754·34 marks (including 6,049,848·41 marks State subsidies) have been paid out, and 95,000,000 marks have been received from the sale of receipt-card stamps.

But this is not the only result of the imperial State Socialism. On March 15, 1890, a labour conference of representatives of the various powers met in Berlin by the invitation of the young emperor, and sat two weeks. The invitation was liberally responded to; but the scope of the deliberations was practically narrowed down to the question of Sunday, female, and juvenile work. In 1891 a bill was passed in the Reichstag to go into force April 1, 1892, embodying the main results of the conference: twenty-four hours' rest on Sunday, except in specified industries, like hotels, etc.; forty-eight hours' rest on church festivals, such as Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunday; women not to work over eleven hours, nor to do any night work, nor for so many weeks after child-birth; children under thirteen not to be employed, and not after that unless they have had the legal time in school.

Such are the main present developments of the imperial State Socialism; but a word should be said of German municipalism, which belongs to the same paternal and therefore unsocialistic school, although valuable as showing what the municipality can do, and as a transition to real Democratic Socialism.

Says Dr. Albert Shaw (*Century*, July, 1894): "The German city holds itself responsible for the education of all; for the provision of amusement, and the means of recreation; for the adaptation of the training of the young to the necessities of gaining a livelihood; for the health of families; for the moral interests of all; for the civilising of the people; for the promotion of individual thrift; for protection from various misfortunes; for the development of advantages and opportunities in order to promote the industrial and commercial well-being; and incidentally for the supply of common services and the introduction of conveniences. The methods it employs to gain its ends are sometimes those advocated by the Socialists, and sometimes they are diametrically opposite."

According to Dr. Shaw, about two-thirds of the larger German cities own and operate their own gasworks, and are going in to provide municipal electric light and power. All German cities care for their own cleaning and sanitation to an extent far beyond that of most other countries. Their systems for providing good housing are growing rapidly more perfect. The cities provide pawnbrokerage and savings banks. Especially admirable is the extent to which they plan far ahead for, and steadily carry out, municipal improvements.

Says Dr. Shaw : " This is largely due, of course, to the superb and continuous organisation of the executive administration. The burgomaster is actually or virtually a life incumbent, and his magisterial associates who conduct the various departments either hold their places by life tenure or else upon terms practically as permanent. The city council, representing the people's will, is renewed by instalments. The terms are long, and re-elections are so usual that the personnel of the body is transformed very slowly, and nothing like an abrupt or capricious change of policy is ever to be feared. Consequently, it is possible to make long plans, to proceed without haste, to distribute burdens through periods of years, to consult minute economies, and to make an even, symmetrical progress that has far more of tangible achievement to show for every half decade than could be possible under our spasmodic American method."

The German police strictly control all life. In some German cities there are police regulations as to how one shall carry his umbrella so as not to hit passers in the street. Germany seems at times under military control.

Such municipalism is certainly not Socialism; and yet, its positive programme of city improvements and municipal services shows how much superior and cheaper are such methods to those of individualism and private competition.

The best English books on German Socialism are Dawson's *German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle*, and his *Bismarck and State Socialism.* For later information, see the Report on Germany of the (English) Royal Commission on Labour. The books in German are innumerable. For information on the Socialist movement in any German city, inquire for some local Socialist paper, especially in Berlin for *Vorwärts* and *Der Zozial Demokrat*, respectively the daily and weekly official organs of the Social Democratic Party, and published at 19 Beuth Strasse, Berlin, which is headquarters for all German Socialist literature. *Die Neue Zeit* of Stuttgart is the best literary Socialist weekly. See Appendix C.

CHAPTER VIII.

SOCIALISM IN BELGIUM.

BELGIAN Socialism has developed characteristics of unusual interest. As early as 1835 the Belgian Colins published in Paris his *Le Pact Social*, sowing the seeds of land nationalisation and of Socialism; while at Ghent, Huet, with his *Règne Sociale du Christianisme*, prepared the way for the later Christian Socialism of his distinguished pupil, De Laveleye, and of the Catholic Christian Socialist, Charles Perin, of Louvain.

It was, however, not this form of Socialism that was first to take root. In 1845 Karl Marx, expelled from Paris, came with Engels to Brussels, and here published his *Discours sur le Libre Échange* and his *Misère de la Philosophie.* In Brussels, too, in 1848 he wrote with Engels the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* for the London Communist League. Such writings naturally had their effect. When the International was formed in 1864 it was planned to hold its first congress in Brussels, but this was not allowed by the Belgian Government. Its third congress, however, met in Brussels in 1868, and by the spring of 1869 it was said to have from 60,000 to 70,000 members in Belgium, its growth being largely due to the efforts of César de Paepe. The International, however, different as we have seen in different countries, took in Belgium an Anarchistic form. At the Hague Congress (1872) the Belgian representatives sided with the Bakunites, "Autonomists," and sent delegates to the "Autonomist" Congresses of Geneva (1873), Brussels (1874), and Berne (1876). But when in 1877 a general congress was held at Ghent, De Paepe declared for a Marxian policy, and the movement became split. At its height the International had claimed from 100,000 to

200,000 members in Belgium. Henceforth, the Socialists and "Autonomists" went separate ways. In 1878 a German "Reading Club" was organised in Brussels, and a new agitation sprang up. Vollmar (see Appendix A), a leading German Socialist, made two tours of propaganda. A congress at Boom in 1878 declared for the Gotha programme, a Socialist Labour Party, and the journals, *Le Voix de l'Ouvrier* of Brussels, *Der Werker* of Antwerp, and *Der Volkswil* of Ghent. Controversy with the Anarchists, however, prevented much progress, the Anarchists having formed an active "Union Révolutionnaire". Belgian Socialism was to develop a character of its own. In the year 1879 a Ghent typewriter, an active Socialist, Edward Anserle (see Appendix A), founded a co-operative bakery, and in connection with it a club, the *Vooruit.* Up to this time co-operation had not succeeded in Belgium, but this Socialist co-operative movement succeeded and spread. A similar organisation, called the *Maison du Peuple* (House of the People), was started by the Brussels Socialists in 1882, and another at Verviers in 1884. In the next four years the movement spread through all the important Belgian cities and industrial centres. Soon the societies began selling other things than bread, till gradually the movement became one of vast size and importance. In 1893 the *Maison du Peuple* had 10,000 members, representing some 10,000 families, and manufacturing 100,000 loaves of bread a week. It possesses a large club-house, which is the centre of Socialist propaganda, a library, a tool store, and other property. It provides coal, groceries, meat, furniture, clothing, medical attendance and insurance, all at co-operative prices. It maintains a monthly, a weekly, and a daily. Every one who belongs to it must adhere to the programme of the (Socialist) Labour Party (*Parti Ouvrier*). Members who for one month deal elsewhere than at the society's establishments may be expelled on a two-thirds vote. A similar work, though not on so large a scale, is carried on by the other Socialist co-operative societies. The *Vooruit* at Ghent in 1893 had 5000 members; but the fact of importance is that these societies form a net-work over Belgium of *Socialist* organisations, providing their members with all the necessities of life, and raising funds for active Socialist propaganda. As a result, Belgian Socialism has recently grown rapidly, and is perhaps better organised than the Socialism of any other country. In 1885 a working man's party was organised (*Parti Ouvrier Socialiste Belge*), which is the political organisation of Belgian Socialism. Its power is seen in the fact that it was able last year (1893) to effect in a few days a veritable revolution in the Belgian constitution. Hitherto the Belgian Socialist had been able to accomplish little politically, because of property limitations to the suffrage. There had been more or less of an agitation on the subject since 1882, but in 1893 the matter came to a head. A bill to introduce Free Suffrage was brought into the Chamber and Senate and defeated. Immediately the Labour Party called a universal strike. There was some opposition and some violence, but in three days a hurried plan to revise the constitution and grant nominally free suffrage (though really with serious restrictions, such as plural voting for men of certain wealth) was devised and carried, and the Labour Party declared the strike off. The bill gives the suffrage to all men over twenty-five, with additional votes to married men over thirty-five, and to men of property. The result was seen in the last election, when the Liberal Party in Belgium was completely overthrown, temporarily putting the Clerical Party into power, but electing a very large number of Socialist deputies, making them easily the second party in the kingdom with hopes of speedily becoming the first.

The present programme of the Belgian Labour Party (*Parti Ouvrier Belge*) is as follows:—

PREAMBLE.

A party has been established amongst the Belgian labour associations, with the object of obtaining for workmen the political rights and material well-being of which they have hitherto been deprived.

Seeing that workmen only acquire these rights and this well-being through their own strength, the party will consist exclusively of labour associations.

Seeing that workmen have to contend against sickness and involuntary stoppage of work, and to secure their wages, the Labour Party will endeavour to obtain the greatest possible advantages for associations instituted with this aim, and to found similar associations in localities where they do not yet exist.

Seeing that workmen, like the rest of the world, have a right to the greatest possible liberty, the widest instruction, a good education, and all the enjoyments of an advanced civilisation, the party will work zealously to attain this end.

Seeing that workmen, in spite of all sacrifices, cannot succeed in instituting pension funds, disablement funds, or funds for assistance in case of sickness, rich enough to pension an old workman, and effectually to support those who are sick or in distress ;

Seeing that the majority of workmen possess neither the material nor the tools for agriculture or industry ;

Finally, seeing that they have absolutely no part in the management of factories, mines or workshops, and are consequently powerless and helpless against industrial and commercial crises, which affect them so terribly ;

The Labour Party is of opinion that the State should intervene to assure the fate of the workman during the period of work, sickness, and old age.

To this end, the Labour Party will not be satisfied with founding funds for assistance in case of sickness, co-operative societies, and protective societies, but it will also take the character of a political party, in order to obtain from the State the support necessary for the perfect well-being of the working classes.

Seeing that Governments conclude international, commercial, postal, and maritime conventions ;

Seeing that the interests of workmen are everywhere identical, and in order to prevent strikers from being supplanted by other workmen in times of difficulty, the Labour Party declares that it wishes to place itself in sympathetic relations with the associated workmen in every country who share its views.

Seeing that the cause of the misery and dependence of the masses is due to the method of working, since the greater part of the workmen do not possess the tools necessary for their work, the Labour Party will endeavour to replace this system of capitalistic production by a mode of working which has for its foundation the common possession of the soil, the sub-soil, and the necessary tools.

In addition to these general objects, and in order to attain its final aim, the Labour Party demands the reforms set forth in the following programme :—

I.—POLITICAL PROGRAMME.

1. Universal suffrage ; direct legislation by the people, that is to say, popular sanction and initiative in legislative matters, secret and compulsory voting ; elections held on Sunday.

2. Secular, compulsory and complete education for all children, to be conducted at the cost of the community, represented by the State or the communes. Higher instruction by means of classes for adults.

3. The separation of Church and State, religion being considered as a private matter, the suppression of religious expenses, and the return to the nation of property "in mortmain," both personal and real, pertaining to religious corporations, as well as all the industrial and commercial property of these corporations.

4. The application, to all cases, of the system of trial by jury, and of settlement by councils of arbitration elected by universal suffrage. Free administration of justice, and the revision, in an equitable sense, of the articles of the code which establish the political or civil inferiority of workmen, women, and natural children.

5. The abolition of conscription, and of the system of substitutes. The equality of military commissions, and the reduction of war expenses. The abolition of standing armies, and the decision of peace and war by the people.

6. The investment of the communes with the control of their own administration, their budget, police, and all their public officers. The nomination by the electors of the burgomaster and sheriffs.

7. A law according State recognition to workmen's syndicates (including amongst other privileges the right to hold property and plead in court).

II.—ECONOMIC PROGRAMME.

8. A rest of one day in each week ; employers to be forbidden to cause work to be done on more than six days out of seven.

9. A law limiting the age at which any person may work, and the duration of such work, in the following manner : (*a*) The abolition of work for children below twelve years of age ; (*b*) a combination of work and instruction, and the abolition of all-night work for young persons from twelve to sixteen years of age ; (*c*) the abolition of the employment of women in all industries in which their employment would be incompatible with morality and health ; (*d*) the establishment by law of a normal working day for adults of both sexes.

10. A commission elected by workmen, and paid by the State, to introduce healthy and safe conditions into workshops. The sanitary supervision of dwellings.

11. The real responsibility of employers in cases of accidents in connection with work, by a law stipulating that it devolves upon the employer to prove, if necessary, that an accident was due to malice on the part of the workman.

12. The regulation of convict labour, so as to put an end to the competition now made with free labour, and to allow prisoners, at the time of their release, means of finding employment, to avoid falling back into crime.

13. Workmen, and, by preference, labour associations, to have a share in the government of workshops. The suppression of fines and deductions from wages. The suppression of benefit funds regulated by employers. The reversal of the management of these funds to the workmen themselves.

14. The reorganisation of councils of *prud'hommes* on a basis of equality. Employers to be forbidden to require testimonials and certificates.

15. The gradual transformation of public charity into one vast system of insurance by the State, the provinces, and the communes.

16. The abolition of all taxes on articles of consumption. The abolition of customs, and a progressive tax on net income.

17. The abolition of all contracts and laws alienating public property (such as the national bank, railways, mines, communal property), and the return of this property to the community, represented, according to the case, by the State or the commune.

18. The abolition of all laws made in favour of employers at the expense of workmen.

Rules of the Belgian Labour Party (*Parti Ouvrier Belge*) :—

AIM AND ORGANISATION.

1. The Belgian Labour Party has been founded with the object of uniting all the resources of labour throughout the country, in order to ameliorate the condition of the working classes by a mutual understanding.

2. In order to accomplish this task, and eventually to realise its highest aim—the complete emancipation of workmen—it will be organised on a political and economic basis.

3. All protective societies (*sociétés de résistance ou maintien de prix*) may belong to the Labour Party, as well as mutual aid societies, co-operative societies, associations for instruction and propaganda, and, generally, all groups of workmen who accept the programme and rules of the party.

4. The Labour Party follows in most particulars the constitution of labour associations and their federations. It will especially support the federation of associations of the same trade throughout the country, and

will endeavour to place them in relation with similar societies in other countries.

5. It is governed by a general council, appointed annually at the congress. This general council will be chosen by preference in towns where there already exists a local federation of members of the party.

6. Each affiliated society pays one centime weekly, for each member, to the strike fund, and ten centimes a year, for each member, towards the expenses of correspondence and propaganda incurred by the general council.

Contribution to the strike fund is only compulsory in the case of protective societies, which alone will directly benefit from it.

The subscriptions are payable in advance, either at the beginning of the social year, for twelve months, or half-yearly. In case of necessity, the subscription to the strike fund may be increased.

7. Each year in congress the general council must present a report on the moral and financial situation of the party. The accounts of the general council must be audited by a committee of at least three members nominated by the congress.

8. The Labour Party undertakes to respect all banners.

9. Associations affiliated to the Labour Party shall not become connected with other associations, except on the condition of maintaining their programme intact.

The General Council.

10. The general council of the Labour Party is composed of six members appointed at each annual congress, and a delegate appointed by each local federation and each trade federation.

11. The general council undertakes the correspondence with all the affiliated societies; and propaganda by means of meetings, conferences, manifestoes, pamphlets, etc., wherever necessary.

Congresses.

12. A congress takes place annually, at the time and place fixed by the preceding congress. All the affiliated societies are bound, except under unavoidable circumstances, to send one or more delegates to represent them at the congress.

After having taken the opinion of the federation, a delegate may represent several groups, but those societies of which he is not a member should transmit to him their votes on the order of the day in writing. An extraordinary congress may be summoned by the general council in case of necessity.

13. Each society may cause to be entered on the agenda of the con-

gress, at least one month before the date fixed, the questions which it desires to have discussed there. Notwithstanding, the congress is always free to regulate the order of the day.

14. Votes are taken by a roll-call of the societies, each society having one vote.

15. All decisions of the congress have the force of law, and are binding on the federated associations.

16. The organisation of the work of the congress, including the formation of committees, is regulated by the congress itself, according to the custom adopted in all labour congresses.

STRIKES.

17. In accordance with Article 6, a special fund is formed for supporting strikes.

This fund is controlled by the general council, and may not be employed for other purposes, except by a decision of a majority of two-thirds of the protective societies taken in congress.

18. All affiliated protective societies, in order to secure the right of sharing in the strike funds, must immediately inform the general council of any dispute which may arise with employers, and ask for its advice. The general council can only refuse support if this decision be taken by a majority of two-thirds of the votes.

19. The allowance to be made is determined according to the state of the funds.

20. In order to be able to claim the financial support of the party, the society on strike must have been affiliated for at least one year, and have paid the contributions.

Notwithstanding, the general council, after having taken the advice of the protective societies, will determine whether financial support shall be given.

PROPAGANDA.

21. In order to propagate its opinions, and work for the organisation of labour (*des forces ouvrières*), the party will arrange meetings and conferences in all localities where it shall deem necessary. It will also employ the services of the press. *Le Peuple*, *Vooruit*, *De Toekomst*, *Der Werker*, *L'Avenir*, and *L'Emancipation* (Liége), are recommended as the organs of the party.

REVISION OF RULES.

22. The present rules may only be revised in congress, and the question must be regularly introduced among the orders of the day.

All proposals for the revision of the rules must obtain two-thirds of the votes, in order to be admitted.

The Belgian Socialists are carrying on an especial agitation against standing armies. The spreading of this idea in the army itself they have entrusted to an organisation of young Socialists, the *jeune garde Socialiste*, who publish an organ of their own. There is also considerable activity among the women, and a paper, *The Woman*, for their interests.

Democratic Socialism is, however, not the only influence working for Socialism in Belgium.

The Kingdom of Belgium, set apart from the Netherlands only in 1830, has had less to unlearn than some kingdoms. Its first king, Leopold I., largely educated in England, had practical industrial ideas, and early introduced State railways, which competed successfully for the through freight from Germany. At present, of the 2810 miles of road in Belgium 2018 belong to the State. Fares are cheaper than anywhere else in the world, except in India; yet, from 1835 to 1892 the total receipts of the State railways were 3,170,642,149 francs, and the total expense of working them 1,859,469,465 francs. Employees are better paid, and work shorter hours than in most trades, and have uniforms, and in some cases small houses furnished free. Posts and telegraphs are also operated by the Government, and there are 609 State Savings Banks. The State has also developed an important system of councils of *prud'hommes* and boards of arbitration, with labour exchanges in many cities and a higher council of labour. It is moving in the direction of employers' liability laws, accident insurance, factory laws, etc., though in this respect it is considerably behind Germany and England.

Christian Socialism has a deep hold on the Roman Church in Belgium; its academic Socialism we have glanced at. For details of Belgian Socialism, see the Foreign Report on Belgium of the (English) Royal Commission on Labour. Information in Belgium can be obtained at the *Maison du Peuple*, 24 Place de Barière, Brussels, at the *Der Werker*, 146 Rue Basse, Antwerp, and similar houses in other cities. The best Socialist daily of Belgium (in French) is *Le Peuple*, 35 Rue des Sables, Brussels.

CHAPTER IX.

SOCIALISM IN SWITZERLAND.

Swiss Socialism is different from the political revolutionary Socialism of Germany, from French communistic Socialism, from Belgian co-operative Socialism, or from English legislative Socialism ; yet, though perhaps in danger of being reactionary, it is Socialism, and has a deep hold upon the national life, because developed in line with the national characteristics.

The first Socialism, however, to enter Switzerland was of an imported type, and took small root. Switzerland has ever been an asylum for political refugees. Here have come Mazzini, Bakunin, and Lassalle, Italian patriots, Russian Nihilists, and German Socialists. It was the last named that introduced Socialism into Switzerland. After the revolution of 1848 German Socialists found their way to Switzerland in large numbers, and formed many Socialist unions. One month after the formation of the International in London in 1864 a branch was organised in Switzerland by J. P. Becker, and in 1866 the Socialist newspaper, *Der Verbote*, was started. In 1867 all the Swiss branches of the International were united into one association, and by 1869 thirty-two branches were said to exist in Geneva alone. When the Socialists, however, led by Marx, at the congress of the International at the Hague, 1872, drove out the Anarchists, Bakunin at Geneva, through the Federation of the Jura, refused to abide by the result, and called "Autonomist" congresses, which claimed to be the true International. The result, however, was after a few years to break up all organisation in a chaos of conflicting opinions. Says the Report on Switzerland of the English Labour Commission :—

These various phases of opinion remained unorganised until 1888, when the present Social Democratic Party was formed. It includes some 1700 members drawn from the more advanced of Swiss Socialists. The organ of the party is the *Arbeiterstimme*, which has a circulation of about 4400 copies. The economic aims of this party, which were stated in detail in the programmes issued in 1888 and 1890, may be summed up in the words centralisation and nationalisation. The Social Democrats demand the gradual nationalisation of the means of transport, of land, and of all the instruments of production. They wish to place education, the law courts, the care of aged, sick, and infirm persons under central State control, and propose the establishment of a permanent commission for economic legislation. They further declare that every citizen has the right to demand employment, and that it is the duty of the State to provide employment for every one who asks it, according to his capabilities. These opinions are opposed by the majority of capitalists and landowners, who are unwilling to exchange their present position for one of dependence on the State, and by economists and scientific men in general, who believe that a system of national production would destroy all talent and enterprise and end in general poverty.

With regard to political matters, the demands of the Socialist party exceed the limitations laid down by the Swiss constitution. They include :—

1. The abolition of the Federal political police, and of all laws which favour one religious or political opinion above another.
2. The introduction of the proportional vote in the Federal elections.
3. The election of the National Council by the people.
4. The introduction of compulsory initiative and referendum.

Such is the outline of what may be called exotic Swiss Socialism.

We now come to consider a native movement, which has sprung up mainly through the Swiss trades unions or working men's societies, and especially through the great society of the *Grütliverein*. Says the Labour Report :—

This association, founded in 1838 at Geneva, takes its name from the scene of the original federal pact made between the three Forest Cantons in 1307, and is now (1893) the largest and most influential union in Switzerland. At the present time it possesses 352 branches, with a total membership of about 15,241 persons. The majority of its members are working men, but it also includes employers and a number of influential statesmen. Foreigners are only admitted as members of the various benefit funds, and are not allowed to vote. The annual revenue arising from the subscriptions of the members amounts to £7000, and the reserve fund has a capital of £14,000. All members are obliged to subscribe to the organ of the society, the *Grütlianer*, which is published in French and German, and has a circulation of about 14,000. Although the association is open to every Swiss without regard to cantonal or religious distinctions, it is in German Switzerland that it has attained its greatest development, 260 out of its 301 branches being situated in German-speaking cantons. This disproportion may be partly accounted for by the fact that large industrial establishments are more frequent in eastern Switzerland than in the western cantons, but, as M. Arago points out, it is also due to the superior tendency towards association of the German people.

The aim of the Grutli society is to advance the interests and improve the position of the working classes, but the society has a political as well as a social and economic programme. It belongs as regards politics to the centralising party, and holds a middle course between liberal and social democratic ideas (*entre la démocratie bourgeoise et la démocratie sociale*). The programme of 1891 embraces the following aims:—

Free and compulsory education, both in elementary and secondary schools; books, etc., to be provided gratis, and poor students to be supported during both stages of their education; labour legislation, including a normal working day fixed to suit local requirements; the further extension and enlargement of the Factory Act, and a ten hours' working day; international regulation of labour protection; the extension of employers' liability in all factories and industries; compulsory sick, accident, and old age insurance; free medical attendance and burial at the cost of the State and communes; the publication of State statistics on the condition of the working classes and on the indebtedness of the land (*Bodenverschuldung*); the fixing of wages at a rate sufficient to secure a moderate subsistence to the worker, taking local circumstances into account; general application of the principle that the same amount of work shall receive the same payment whether done by a man or a woman; State regulation of labour registries, public labour registries with low fees, compulsory trades unions; free administration of justice, trades courts of arbitration (*prud'hommes*), reform of taxation on the principle of progressive probate duties and progressive succession duties; State monopoly of insurance systems, railways, and banks (first step, a Federal bank, with the monopoly of bank notes); tobacco, match, and grain monopolies; State control of sanitation and the food supply; sanitary inspection of factories, workshops, and the houses of home-workers; study of the question of land tenure reform.

We now come to a most important development. On August 28, 1886, the society proposed to the Federal Department of Commerce the appointment of a Workmen's Secretary, to be paid by the Government like any other Government Secretary, but to be selected by the *Grütliverein*, a condition which it finally agreed to modify to being selected by a body representing all Swiss trades unions and working men's societies. The proposal was accepted, and on April 10, 1887, working men's delegates met at Aarau to elect the first Workmen's Secretary. Says the report :—

> The congress was attended by 158 voting and 37 passive deputies, representing 22 central unions and 120 local unions, including trades unions and sick and mutual aid societies from all the cantons.
>
> After settling minor points, the Grutli presented to the congress a set of draft rules for the union of all Swiss workmen's societies in one organisation, to be entitled the Swiss Workmen's Federation (*Schweizerische Arbeiterbund*). This Federation was to be entirely occupied with matters of common interest to all the associated societies, while the separate societies were to retain their full right of independent political action.
>
> The Federation thus constituted included, first, the Grutli, which then numbered 13,000 members ; secondly, 29 centralised workmen's associations, and thirdly, a large number of cantonal and local unions and benefit societies. The total number of members at the commencement of the Federation was thus 103,000, and this number had risen in 1893 to 200,000.
>
> The object of the Federation, as stated in Rule 1, is to represent the collective economic interests of the Swiss working classes, and for this purpose all the associated societies bind themselves to co-operate in all statistical returns, and to furnish any information which is required of them.
>
> Rule 2 enumerates the following bodies as constituting the organisation of the Federation :—
>
> (*a*) The assembly of delegates.
> (*b*) The central committee of the Federation.
> (*c*) The committee of control.
> (*d*) The permanent workmen's secretary.
>
> The ordinary assembly of delegates is to take place every three years. The delegates are named by the societies and associations which form the Federation. Each society has a right to one delegate, but in order to have a deliberative vote the delegate must represent at least 250 members. The central committee of the Federation fixes the date and place of meeting of the assembly of delegates ; extraordinary meetings can be convened either by the central committee or on the demand of societies which unite one-tenth of the entire number of members represented in the Federation.
>
> The central committee is composed of twenty-three members, elected

for three years by the assembly of delegates. All its members must be Swiss citizens, and two-thirds must be *boná fide* working men. The central committee must be constituted in such a manner as to represent in due proportion the federated societies, the three national languages, and the chief industries and trades to which the members of the Federation belong.

The workmen's secretary is elected by the central committee for a term of three years; he must be a Swiss citizen. The duties and sphere of action of the secretary are fixed by rules drawn up by the central committee, to which body he must also submit the programme of his work and his accounts. The committee of control is responsible for the immediate supervision of the business of the secretary's office.

The secretary must answer all inquiries, and furnish the statistical returns and reports on labour questions which are required by the federated societies. He is entitled to correspond directly with (Government) authorities, associations, societies, and private persons concerning any information he may require.

The federal grant is intended to defray the expenses of the secretary. All other expenses, particularly those of the assembly of delegates, the meetings of the central committee, etc., must be borne by the societies represented at the meetings.

The duties of the secretary are further defined as those imposed upon him by the rules of the Federation, the decisions of the two committees, and by the wishes of the federal department. His principal duty is to investigate the condition of the working classes, to study questions of social economy, and draw up reports on these subjects. He also issues an annual report on the administration of his office, including a programme for the work of the following year.

Herr Greulich, a statistician of Zurich, was elected secretary in 1887, and re-elected in 1890; he has since been allowed the help of two permanent assistants, and in 1891 M. A. Schwitzguebel of Bienne was appointed workmen's secretary for the Roman cantons. The federal grant was also increased in the same year to the sum of 25,000 francs. Herr Greulich's annual reports have dealt with the question of general compulsory insurance against sickness and accidents; he has also compiled accident statistics in the different cantons, and has published an account of municipal institutions for the benefit of the working classes in Paris. The wages statistics which he has been collecting ever since he came into office are, owing to the difficult and complicated nature of the work, not yet ready for publication. The secretary has further been engaged in organising bodies of *prud'hommes* for the settlement of trade disputes, and has also supplied advice and information to individual workmen with regard to the execution of federal labour legislation. It is not considered desirable that the secretary's duties should be complicated by any attempt to interfere in purely local or cantonal matters, nor in conflicts between individual workmen or isolated groups of workmen and their employers. Any assistance or interference desired in such cases can, it is thought, be better afforded by the officials which are in closer contact with these groups.

Remarkable in itself, this movement is still more significant for what it involves. It involves nothing less than a practical recognition of trades unions, as a constituent portion of the Government, since they elect and control a paid official of the Government. But this is by no means the only advance Switzerland has made towards Socialism. Perhaps even more significant is the recognition of the right to work, which is becoming general in Switzerland. In January, 1892, the Swiss Socialists in the canton of Berne commenced to agitate for a constitutional amendment, guaranteeing to all Swiss workmen "the right to remunerative work". It must be remembered that in Switzerland any petition signed by 50,000 men citizens (the Initiative) must be submitted to the citizens for rejection or adoption by popular vote (the Referendum). To this petition the Socialists undertook to secure the requisite number of votes; and though in similar previous efforts they had never succeeded, for this petition they easily secured 52,000 names. The text of the petition was substantially as follows :—

The right to properly remunerative work is recognised by every Swiss citizen. Legislation, federal, cantonal, and communal (municipal), must render this right effective by every means in its power. Particularly should it adopt the following methods :—

(*a*) By methods which shall tend to make work more abundant, notably through decreasing the hours of work in as many branches of industry as possible.

(*b*) By creating free bureaux for obtaining work for the unemployed, offices which shall be directly under the control of the workers themselves.

(*c*) By legal paction of employees against unjustifiable discharge.

(*d*) By ensuring workmen against the results of being out of work, either through a system of State insurance, or by insuring them in private institutions through public funds.

(*e*) By so protecting the right of organisation among working men that

> organisations aiming at defending the interests of working men against their employers shall not be prevented nor workmen be prevented from joining them.
>
> (*f*) By the establishment of legal organisations of workmen in dealing with employers, and the democratic organisation of labour in factories and workshops, especially those of the State or communes (municipalities).

One is struck in reading this at once by its conservatism and its radicalism. It proposes nothing revolutionary in regard to property; it makes no reference to replacing private enterprise by State production; it builds up no cumbersome machinery or involved programme; it is, if anything, rather too vague, simply indicating a principle with suggested methods, yet leaving legislation wholly free to determine the details; it indulges in no talk about the rights of man; but it does go right to the point in asking that the State take upon itself the duty of seeing that every man has the right assured him by the State of self-supporting work. Here, again, is the Socialist principle in strong, unique application. It is true that on its being referred to the people the amendment was defeated, but it secured a very large vote, and will, without doubt, be ultimately adopted.

The Swiss Socialists rightly view it as a triumph that a principle yesterday looked upon as a heresy should to-day be seriously discussed by a free State; nor did the failure of State action preclude municipal action. Says the report:—

> Without waiting for federal legislation, the town of Berne immediately proceeded to establish an out-of-work insurance society. The insurance institution is managed by the district authorities through the agency of their labour bureau. The committee of management consists of seven members, three of whom are chosen by the district authorities, two by the employers, and two by the members of the society. Every workman in the district may become a member on the payment of a monthly subscription of forty centimes; unionists can enrol themselves through their unions. The fund is supported by these subscriptions, by contributions from employers, by a subsidy from the district (*Gemeinde*), which may not exceed 5000 francs a year, and by donations. Workmen who have subscribed during six months and have been out of work for at least two weeks are entitled to a benefit of at most one franc a week if single and one franc eighty cents if they are married men. The rules also provide

for cases in which men out of work through their own fault are not to receive assistance.

The example thus set by the town of Berne has been rapidly followed by Urban Bâle and St. Gall, where similar institutions have been started.

Municipal labour bureaux, too, are common in Switzerland.

Labour bureaux, supported partly by the district authorities and partly by benevolent societies, exist at Berne, St. Gall, Baar, Geneva, and Zurich. Bâle has a State bureau. The Zurich bureau, founded in 1885, is connected with the voluntary union for poor relief (*armenverein*), and comprises separate sections for men and women. The men's division has not prospered, as it is found that the least capable workmen and the worst employers are the only ones who avail themselves of its services. The women's division shows better results, and is extending its operations year by year.

The bureau at Berne is a communal (*Gemeinde*) institution; it was founded in 1888, and is managed by a committee consisting of members of the district council, the artisans' union (*Handwerkerverein*), the general workmen's union of the town, and the Grutli society.

Such are the two most important developments of Swiss Socialism, but not the only ones. It must not be forgotten that the adoption of the Referendum and of the Initiative, whereby all important questions may be, and to a varying extent according to the different federal, cantonal, and municipal constitutions, must be referred to a final vote of the people, while all petitions signed, as we have seen, by enough citizens must be so referred, are themselves long steps towards Socialism, or the identification of the people with the Government and of Government with industrial life.

While Switzerland thus has her unique features, and in these leads the world, she is, to say the least, not far behind in other lines. Her industrial legislation increases year by year, but needs no especial notice. The municipalities are making great efforts to improve workmen's dwellings. Swiss municipal and cantonal industrial museums and technical schools are among the best in the world. These include schools in watchmaking, wood carving, cotton and silk weaving, agriculture, etc., etc. Especially important are some of the Swiss experiments with the apprentice problem. Says the report :—

A new law for the regulation of apprenticeship in Neuchâtel came into force in February, 1891, from which much good is expected. The aim of the law is to raise the status of apprentices and to develop industrial skill in the different trades practised in the canton, but especially in the watchmaking industry. To this end all apprentices are placed under the supervision of the communal authority, which can delegate its powers to a select committee, composed of equal numbers of employers and employed. Where *Conseils de Prud'hommes* or trade syndicates exist this supervision can be entrusted to them. The committee must from time to time visit the workshops where apprentices are employed, and see that the latter are properly taught and treated. Masters are forbidden to take apprentices without a written contract, or to employ them in other than their proper occupation, and they are also required to allow them sufficient time for religious and secular instruction. The hours of labour are fixed at ten per day for apprentices between the ages of thirteen and fifteen, and at eleven hours a day for those over fifteen, the hours devoted to education being included.

Most interesting among the federal activities is the alcohol monopoly.

The Swiss Federal Government undertook the monopoly of alcohol in the year 1887. The objects of this monopoly were principally fiscal and sanitary. Prior to this date private distilleries existed in great numbers all over the country, and the "schnaps" produced in them was the daily drink of the peasants. Dr. Schild, writing in 1864, stated that in many cases respectable peasant families had been ruined through the disastrous consequences of "schnaps" drinking. The extent of this private distillation may be inferred from the fact that since 1887, when the new laws came into force, 1400 distilleries, large and small, have been brought out, and between sixty and seventy remain. The latter, however, can now sell their products only to the monopoly administration. The nature of the control now exercised consists in making the State the sole vendor of alcohol, and its aim is simply to prevent drunkenness. The law does not attempt to promote total abstinence; such a course would indeed be useless, for the principle is practically unknown in Switzerland. A temperance society, known as the "Blue Cross," does exist, but the number of its members is small (5348 in 1890), and its influence on practical politics infinitesimal.

With regard to the home trade the action of the administration is twofold: (1) home-made spirits are bought by the monopoly administration, by whom they are rectified and re-sold at monopoly prices. Spirit made from home-grown fruits is not controlled by the monopoly, only that extracted from beer, potatoes, etc.; (2) the duties on all raw spirit and brandy made from foreign fruits, beer, and roots are raised. All imported raw spirits and brandy are purchased by the administration, rectified, and re-sold at monopoly prices, and high duties are imposed on all brandy and liqueurs imported by private individuals. The monopoly administration has no control over the ultimate distribution of the spirit, nor any control over the manner in which it is dealt with after leaving the offices of the monopoly.

In order to ensure the moral aim of the monopoly, the law establishing it provides that one-tenth of the profits, which are distributed among the cantonal governments, must be applied by them in combating the cases and effects of alcoholism. The sum which ought to have been thus spent by the cantons amounted for the year 1891 to 565,123 francs (£22,605); of this sum about £18,500 has been expended on objects more or less connected with the prescribed aim, and £4000 is still held in reserve. But of the £18,500 only about £4600 was devoted to combating the causes of alcoholism, and the remainder of 61 per cent. of the united tenths has been applied to relieving sufferers from the effects of intemperance.

Since the introduction of the monopoly system the duties on distilled liquors have been nearly trebled, and the result has been a great decrease in their consumption. In 1882 the consumption of spirit per head was 9·4 litres, and in 1885 this had risen to 10·36 litres, while in 1890 the consumption per head had fallen to 6·27, and in 1891 to 6·32 litres. It must also be remembered as another advantage of the new system that the spirit which has passed the monopoly administration is pure and therefore far less injurious than the "schnaps" of former days. The above figures as to the comparative consumption of liquor before and after the introduction of the monopoly must be taken with some reserve. Firstly, before the monopoly, some proportion of the liquor distilled in Switzerland, and here accredited to the consumption of the native population, was actually smuggled into foreign countries. Under the present system smuggling is more carefully watched than was possible in the old days of private stills, and it has now sunk to insignificant proportions. Nevertheless, allowance being made for this deduction, the decrease in the use of spirituous liquors is estimated by Herr Milliet, the director of the monopoly administration, at 25 per cent. Against this must be set a slight increase in the use of wine and a considerable increase in that of beer, due to the fact that the duties on these articles have been lowered by the monopoly administration. A second limitation on the statistics of decrease is the suspicion that a certain portion of the raw spirit which is denaturalised each year by the administration is again made potable by fraudulent means. The canton of Urban Bâle has taken measures to prevent fraud by giving its government the monopoly of the retail alcohol trade, thus offering a surer guarantee of its purity to the eventual consumer. Individual purchasers are obliged to buy from the cantonal *Régie*, but the canton does not attempt to dictate to individuals as to how they shall dispose of their purchases.

Christian Socialism has some hold in Switzerland. There are two Protestant societies in Geneva and a Roman Catholic society in Zurich.

The best English authority on Socialism in Switzerland is the Report on Switzerland of the Royal Commission on Labour, from which we have so largely quoted. Among the best Swiss Socialist papers are the *Arbeiterstimme*, *Secretariat Ouvrier Suisse*, and the *Grütliarun* of Zurich, and the *Grütli* of Lausanne.

CHAPTER X.

SOCIALISM IN THE UNITED STATES.

SOCIALISM has appeared in the United States under at least five different and almost totally disconnected forms. It has appeared as a movement towards the establishment of socialistic communities or communisms; it has appeared as Fourierism, as German or International Socialism, as Nationalism, and as Christian Socialism.

The communistic efforts were the earliest, although even these were preceded by a few rudimentary and unenduring attempts at a partial Socialism. Prof. Ely has pointed out in his *Labour Movement in America* that, at Jamestown, according to the "oldest American charter," under which the first English settlement was made on American soil, one condition stipulated by King James was a common storehouse into which products were to be poured, and from which they were to be distributed according to the needs of the colonists, an industrial constitution under which the first inhabitants of Jamestown lived for five years. It did not work, because all the colonists were by no means ready for it. We are told that the adventurous idlers and "played-out gentlemen," of whom the colony largely consisted, gave so much trouble that the old soldier, Captain John Smith, was forced to declare in vigorous language, and with threats not to be misunderstood, that "he that will not work shall not eat".

The first pilgrims, too, who emigrated to New England were bound by a somewhat similar arrangement which they had entered into with London merchants, though the issue of the experiment was not more successful, and it was partially abandoned; not wholly, however, for a great deal of land was long after held in common, and, indeed, to-day, many parcels of this land still stand in New England towns, and notably in Boston, as *commons*, mute witnesses of some of the old principles of brotherhood, and often of religious brotherhood, which lie at the foundation of the "commonwealth" of Massachusetts and of many States inside and outside of New England.

Passing by, however, these rudimentary forms, to the Shakers belongs the credit of instituting at once the first and the most enduring Socialistic communities in America. They came to America in 1774, led by "Mother" Ann Lee, in obedience to the heavenly vision, that they might lead here a life according to their convictions. At first not practising Communism, they soon learned to do so, and their first establishment, Mount Lebanon, in Columbia county, New York, is still the home of the strongest Shaker settlement in the land, existing and growing in wealth to-day, after a history of 106 years, a living contradiction to those who consider Communism utterly beyond the pale of practicability. There are also several other large and prosperous Shaker communities living in groups or celibate "families," quietly working in common for the good of all, and practising equal enjoyment of whatever is produced. Economic failure they have never known, and to the future they look forward with steadfast hope. Their religious tenets we cannot here discuss. Suffice it to say they enter upon their communal life with religious conviction, and carry it on in a spirit of the deepest duty. That, however, the Shaker communities are a complete success we by no means assert; that they will continue to endure is more than doubtful. Their religious spirit and their character of faithfulness and honesty have been their safeguard. The latter will, doubtless, remain with the faithful few; but with advancing thought will the world continue to follow the tenets of "Mother" Ann Lee, or any narrow religious sectarianism?

Next in age, and perhaps next in importance among the religious Communists, stand the Harmonists or the followers of George Rapp. George Rapp was born in Wurtemberg in 1757, and came to this country with a little band of followers in 1803.

Settling first in Pennsylvania, they moved soon to Harmony in Indiana, and later, in 1825, selling out to Robert Owen, they went to Economy, near Pittsburg, where they still are. Practising celibacy, they are dependent upon converts for numerical growth, and converts do not come. Their Communism is also a part of their Christianity. It makes them faithful, honest, successful; but since they have not grown in numbers, they are to-day little more than a corporation, which has grown enormously wealthy through investments, and hires numerous employees, who are indeed treated well, but not made members of the community. When the present aged members have passed away, it is doubtful how long the community will endure as in any sense a Communism. The same is true of the little band of Separatists, as they called themselves, who, led by Joseph Baumeler, came to this country, also from Wurtemberg, and with the assistance of some Quakers purchased land at Zoar, in Pennsylvania, in 1817, where they exist to-day, prosperous and rich. Zoar and Amana are the strongest Communistic societies in the United States, excepting only the Shakers. Among Separatists, however, marriage is allowed, and they number now some three or four hundred souls. Prof. R. T. Ely gave their wealth in 1886 as 1,500,000 dols., or a *per capita* wealth of 5000 dols. But they too are losing in numbers.

Much more successful from the standpoint of true Socialism is—

Amana, another German colony of a sect beginning in the Fatherland in the eighteenth century, but not attaining strength till 1817, when Christian Metz became, as he believed, an "instrument" of revelation to lead his followers on to a higher and a communal life. They came to this country in 1842 and settled near Buffalo, N.Y., whence they moved to Ebenezer and later to Amana, in Ohio, in 1855. Amana is not a village, but a plain with seven villages all tied together in the bonds of Communism. The Amana community believes in marriage and the family, and is, upon the whole, perhaps the broadest and most attractive existing Communism in America.

Among these communities must undoubtedly be included the Oneida community, or the "Perfectionists," established by John Humphrey Noyes at Oneida, N.Y., in 1847, with a smaller community at Wallingford.

Economically, this community too succeeded, being wrecked on other lines. Noyes believed in what he would call collective marriage. He claimed that it was not free love, since the relations between men and women were not left to the shifting caprice of love or of desire, but were entered into with religious ceremony and thoughtfulness. One woman was not tied to one man, or *vice versâ*, but all were tied together. Enduring many years, New York State was, on account of their marital practices, at last made too hot for them, and the community as a religious community dissolved in 1881, existing to-day only as a joint-stock concern for the management of their wealth.

Such have been the main but by no means the only religious Communistic Socialists in the United States. Hopedale, in Massachusetts, founded by Rev. Adin Ballou, a relative of the great Universalist; Brockton, in New York State, founded by Thomas L. Harris, now of California, and author of *The New Republic;* Mountain Cove community (Spiritualistic); Aurora, in Oregon; and Bethel, in Missouri, are all of interest, and have endured for a longer or shorter time, finally however splitting on the rocks of discord or of unwise management.

We come now to another class of communities, which, though the most numerous, are on the whole of least importance. We call them Secularist communities, not because they all held Secularist doctrines, but as indicating their opposition to any spiritual or revealed religion. The first and most interesting of these was New Harmony. In 1824, after his industrial experiments at New Lanark, in Scotland, Robert Owen bought, as above related, of the German Rappists, Harmony, and calling it New Harmony, established a colony. Entering into land and buildings prepared by the Rappists, some 900 persons were gathered from all portions of the United States. Education was made prominent; religious thought was unfettered; all worked for the good of all. Hope was on every hand. But there was no deep bond of union. Dissensions sprang up. Various methods of conducting the community were attempted, some wholly Communistic, others only partly so; Mr. Owen was at one time sole manager, at another time a committee was elected to manage the community; separation was tried, to let different parties manage affairs in different ways, but the trouble lay not in the mode of management, but the lack of unity. In 1827 the community was virtually at an end.

Akin to this, though more enduring, was the non-religious community of Icaria, established in 1848 by some French followers of Cabet, the author of the charming Communistic romance, *Voyage en Icarie.* Headed by Cabet himself, it numbered at one time 1500 souls, and for five or six years was successful. Dissensions, however, set in, and finally Cabet and 170 adherents departed and removed to St. Louis, Mo., where the enthusiast died in 1856. The remnant of the community still exists at Corning, in Iowa, out of debt, but very weak, and numbering less than forty souls, including men, women, and children.

Much more recent, mainly within the last decade, have been the attempts at communities at Kaweah, in California, and Topolobampo, in Mexico. The former has already disappeared, owing partly to dissensions and even more to the opposition of jealous corporations, who prevailed upon the United States Government to invalidate their land titles. The colony at Topolobampo is much more important. It commenced on a large scale and with great energy, under a favourable charter from the Mexican Government, but a serious dissension already threatens to divide the movement. Of a few existing communities we do not here speak. They are of too recent formation to have an assured future, though at least one in Tennessee is very promising; but Socialism, as we have seen in chapter iii., is learning to be very cautious of such communisms.

Such are the main, though by no means the only, attempts at Communistic settlements in the United States, apart from the Fourierist movement, which we next consider. The Fourierist wave of Communistic Socialism swept over the country from 1840 to 1850.

In 1840 Albert Brisbane published his *Social Destiny of Man*, a presentation of Fourierism. In 1843 Horace Greeley opened the columns of the New York *Tribune* to the teachings of Brisbane, and Socialistic articles appeared in its columns at first once a week and then every day. There was a rush into Fourierist communities or "phalanxes". "By 1843," says Noyes in his *History of American Socialisms*, "phalanxes by the dozen were on the march for the new world of wealth and harmony." A paper, entitled *The Phalanx*, was started and edited by Brisbane. In 1844 a national convention of associations was held at Clifton Hall, New York city, with George Ripley for president and Charles A. Dana, Brisbane, and Horace Greeley among the vice-presidents.

The Sylvania Association was the first phalanx, and was located in Lackawaxen, Pa. It had 145 members, and owned 2300 acres of land. Greeley was one of its officers. It existed two years, and then failed, mainly from lack of management. There was said to have been not a practical farmer among them. It was the type of most of the Fourierist communities.

The North American phalanx was the most successful, enduring twelve years. Situated in Monmouth, N. J., it commenced in 1843 with twelve members and a capital of 8000 dols. By 1844 it had seventy-seven members and a capital of 28,000 dols. In 1854 it suffered heavily from fire, and then more from dissension, coming to an end in 1855.

Noyes, in his book, enumerates thirty-four phalanxes, most of them, however, too insignificant to deserve mention here. Undoubtedly the greatest and best of them all was Brook Farm, near Boston. It did not begin as a Fourierist phalanx. It seems to have owed its inception to a suggestion from Dr. William E. Channing. His thought, however, fell on friendly soil, and Boston's culture and Boston's genius joined the new enterprise. Not professedly religious, it was still largely Unitarian, or more exactly, Transcendental. George Ripley, Dr. J. C. Warren, Theodore Parker, Margaret Fuller, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and George William Curtis were all more or less interested, many of them being residents. Ralph Waldo Emerson and Dr. Channing were interested, though not residents. *The Dial*, published from 1840 to 1844 by Margaret Fuller, was its main organ. The best brains of Boston delighted to come here; its members discussed philosophy and milked cows and hoed potatoes, greatly to their enjoyment and their health, if not greatly to the benefit of their pockets. In 1844 it became avowedly Fourierist, and then gradually went down, partly from misfortune in having its central house or phalanstery burnt, mainly from lack of business management. In 1846 it was practically at an end.

The trouble with all the Fourierist communities was that they were fanciful and theoretical schemes, not simple and natural growths. They had little definite religious spirit to hold them together.

In America all the secular Communisms seem to have failed; almost all the religious Communisms seem to have financially succeeded, but to have been too narrow to admit of enlargement and growth.

Marxian, International, or Democratic Socialism entered the United States about 1849, with German and other refugees, after the putting down of the European revolutions of 1848. Prominent among these was Wilhelm Weitling, often called "the Father of German Communism," almost more truly called "the Father of American Democratic Socialism". He founded a working men's society in New York, called the Arbeiterbund, with headquarters in Beekman Street. Here was published for three years *Die Republik der Arbeiter*, the first really socialistic paper in the United States. Associated with him was Dr. Edmund Ignatz Koch, a man who had been active in European revolutions, and who is said to have brought to America a thousand copies of a Communist work by Blanqui. Others of the little band were Wedemeyer, a friend and disciple of Marx, and H. Meyer, a German merchant. Weitling, however, finally abandoned Communistic ideas, and devoted himself to inventions and astronomy. Still the seed he sowed took root. Says Prof. Ely, from whose *Labour Movement in America* we largely condense this portion of our article: "The first large society to adopt and propagate Socialism in America was composed of the German Gymnastic Unions (Turnvereine). The Socialistic Turnvereine of New York drew up a constitution for an association to be composed of the various local gymnastic unions, and published it in 1850." Preliminary meetings were held at the Shakspeare Hotel in New York. On October 5, 1850, a meeting was held in Philadelphia to appoint a permanent organisation. Several Turnvereine acted on the suggestion, and, among others, delegates were present from New York, Boston, and Baltimore. The first name adopted was "Associated Gymnastic Unions of North America" (Vereinigte Turnvereine Nordamerikas), which was, however, changed the following year to "Socialistic Gymnastic Union" (Socialistischer Turnerbund). The platform adopted proclaimed the promotion of Socialism and the support of the Social Democratic Party to be its chief purpose. The education of the mind was to accompany the training of the body, that the whole man might be developed in accordance with the maxim, *mens sana in corpore sano;* and this idea has always been prominent among the members of this society in America. The number of local gymnastic unions in America in 1851, so far as known, was seventeen; of which the three largest were the Baltimore Social Democratic Turnvereine with 278 members, the Cincinnati Turngemeinde with 222 members, and the New York Socialistic Turnvereine with 128. A monthly organ was published, called the *Turnzeitung*. The Turnerbund continued to grow slowly in strength until the Civil War, although internal dissensions divided it for a few years into two sections. The beginning of the Civil War offered the Turnerbund the opportunity they desired, to earn a good name for themselves and for their fellow-countrymen. It is estimated that from forty to fifty per cent. of all Turners capable of bearing arms took part in the war. Prominent among them was General Franz Sigel. This depletion of the local unions suspended all activities on the part of the Socialistic Turnerbund, until the close of the war, when it was reorganised under the name of the North American Gymnastic Union (Nordamerikanischer Turnerbund). The Turnerbund is no longer nominally Socialistic; but it recommends the careful study of social questions, and has adopted resolutions in favour of radical reforms. In its platform the aims of the Society are stated to be these: the development of men strong in mind and body, and the development of a true democracy. In accordance with its general conservative character it declares that social, religious, and political reforms can only be secured by the spread of education and morality.

The sovereignty of the people is declared to be inalienable, and reforms are recommended which aim at realising democratic institutions; in particular, the replacement of Senate and President by a Federal Council. The recall of legislators by the people is further recommended, and also the abolition of all complicated modes of representation and artificial delegation of power.

The general convention likewise recommends "the protection of labour against spoliation, and the adoption of means to secure to it its real product; the sanitary protection of citizens by control over factories," etc. Child labour is condemned. Debates and lectures are held, largely on Socialistic themes.

More direct Socialistic organisation, however, continued. In 1857 a club of Communists was formed in New York city, mostly of German refugees, and in June, 1858, a celebration of the Paris insurrection of 1848 called out several thousand men and women. The war suspended but did not break up this movement, and in 1867 another organisation having been effected by the followers of Lassalle, in New York city, the two societies united, and were called the Social Party. In 1869 this became affiliated with the International, and its ideas spread rapidly. Between 1870 and 1873 many sections of the International sprang up all over the country, and not a few of the trades unions joined the movement. As early as 1869 a delegate from the North American Central Committee of the International regularly attended the New York City Working Men's Union, composed of delegates representing trades unions aggregating a membership of from thirty to forty thousand. The same year J. George Eccarius, General Secretary of the European Central Council of the International, wrote to the National Labour Union in session in Philadelphia to send a delegate to the International Congress to be held at Basle in September of that year, and a delegate, Cameron, was sent. It must be remembered, however, that the International, although containing and, later, best known by its Radical, Socialist, and even Anarchist members, was not committed to revolutionary Socialism, and the English and American trades unionists, who joined it at this time, simply joined it as an International Working Men's Union. When it declared for more revolutionary principles they dropped off.

In 1871 a new impetus was given to radical Socialism in America by the refugees that came from Paris after the suppression of the Commune. A more important event was the transference of the General Council of the International to New York city in 1872, after the split at the Hague Congress between the Socialists and the Anarchists, the idea being to save the International from the attacks of the Anarchists, by transferring it to the American continent. It proved, however, the gradual death of the International. The division between the Anarchists and Socialists reappeared upon the new shores. In 1873 outspoken weekly advocates of Socialism were started in New York city and Chicago, the Chicago weekly, *Die Vorbate*, continuing to the present time, though now an organ of Anarchism. National congresses were held under different names at Philadelphia in 1874; Pittsburg, 1876; Newark, 1877; Alleghany City, 1880. All this time the split between the Anarchists and Socialists was growing wider. In December, 1882, Johann Most arrived in New York city, and proved a firebrand. In 1883 the Anarchists met at Pittsburg, and the Socialists at Baltimore. Yet a vote to repudiate Most was not carried at Baltimore. When, however, the London outrages of 1885 were condemned by the Socialists, and applauded by the Anarchists, separation became absolute, and the two parties came to blows in a meeting in New York city. The Socialists are henceforth known as the Socialist Labour Party, a name adopted by the Newark Congress of 1877, with a programme modelled after the Gotha Programme (see chapter vii., "Socialism in Germany"). The Anarchists took the old name of the International Working People's Association, thus giving it a very different colouring from what it once had, and confusing many minds as they read of the old and orderly International of Marx and the Socialists and trades unions. With the Anarchists we have no more to do. The Socialist Labour Party we must now follow. It has grown steadily, and yet slowly, being held back, because, although a few Americans by birth have joined it, it was organised by Germans, and has mainly continued among them. It has thus been too confused in the popular mind with the Anarchist movement to receive the attention that has been its due. As a matter of fact, it has been utterly distinct from and opposed to the Anarchist movement. It declares for the Socialistic State, to be realised by a capture of the present State through orderly political methods. The head of the party is a national executive committee, with headquarters in New York city. It has had many organs, notably the *Sozialist*, the *New Yorker Volkszeitung*, the *Tageblatt*, of Philadelphia, later the *Workman's Advocate*, and now *The People*, of New York city, in English, and the *Vorwärts*, in German. Till 1889 very little progress was made. The hanging of the Chicago Anarchists in 1887 was protested against by the Socialists, and resulted in increased popular confusion of Anarchism and Socialism. In 1886 the Socialists of New York city entered enthusiastically into the Henry George campaign for the mayoralty, and aided him to poll the phenomenal vote of 68,000; but in 1887 Mr. George saw fit to expel the Socialists from the State convention of his (the United Labour) party, and the result was the utter defeat of his party in the State, but also temporarily a set back to the Socialists. In 1888 they nominated a mayor from New York city (Jonas), but he only received 2000 votes. The party, too, was divided over the question whether to work through or oppose the trades union movement. In 1889 personal jealousies and divisions of opinion led to a violent change in the conduct of the party organ in New York city, and the complete reorganisation of the party at the Chicago Convention of October 12, 1889. Since then, and especially of late, growth has been more rapid, although still few native Americans belong to the movement, and this prevents, and while it continues must prevent, it from obtaining large proportions, its sharp criticism of all other efforts at social reform contributing to prevent its growth. At the Chicago Convention the fundamental lines for future agitation were laid down, and the unity of the economic and political movement was proclaimed. Since then, one of the leading endeavours of American Socialists has been to promote the New Trades Unionism, which, in aims and methods, is at one with and inseparable from the Socialist Labour Party. As a matter of course, the Socialist Labour Party, together with its New Trades Unionist allies, has from that time on taken the field independently at every campaign. The results of this policy were not long in coming. Already in 1890 the Socialist vote in the State of New York rose to 13,337; in 1891, to 14,561; in 1892, when the party for the first time set up its own Presidential candidate, to 18,147; in 1893, to over 22,000. Through the country it polls but a small vote. *The World's* "Almanac" puts it as only 21,167 for the whole country for the Presidential election of 1892, but it was probably larger than this.

The present platform of the Socialist Labour Party, first adopted at the Chicago Convention, October 12, 1889, and since amended, is as follows:—

The Socialist Labour Party of the United States, in convention assembled, re-asserts the inalienable right of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

With the founders of the American Republic we hold that the purpose of government is to secure every citizen in the enjoyment of this right; but in the light of our social conditions we hold, furthermore, that no such right can be exercised under a system of inequality, essentially destructive of life, of liberty, and of happiness.

With the founders of this republic we hold that the true theory of politics is that the machinery of government must be owned and controlled by the whole people; but in the light of our industrial development we hold, furthermore, that the true theory of economics is that the machinery of production must likewise belong to the people in common.

To the obvious fact that our despotic system of economics is the direct opposite of our democratic system of politics, can plainly be traced the existence of a privileged class, the corruption of government by that class, the alienation of public property, public franchises, and public functions to that class, and the abject dependence of the mightiest of nations upon that class.

Again, through the perversion of democracy to the ends of plutocracy, labour is robbed of the wealth which it alone produces, is denied the means of self-employment, and, by compulsory idleness in wage slavery, is even deprived of the necessaries of life.

Human power and natural forces are thus wasted, that the plutocracy may rule.

Ignorance and misery, with all their concomitant evils, are perpetuated, that the people may be kept in bondage.

Science and invention are diverted from their humane purpose to the enslavement of women and children.

Against such a system the Socialist Labour Party once more enters its protest. Once more it reiterates its fundamental declaration that private property in the natural sources of production and in the instruments of labour is the obvious cause of all economic servitude and political dependence; and

Whereas, the time is fast coming when, in the natural course of socia evolution, this system, through the destructive action of its failures and crises on the one hand, and the constructive tendencies of its trusts and other capitalistic combinations on the other hand, shall have worked out its own downfall; therefore be it

Resolved, that we call upon the people to organise with a view to the substitution of the co-operative commonwealth for the present state of planless production, industrial war and social disorder; a commonwealth in which every worker shall have the free exercise and full benefit of his faculties, multiplied by all the modern factors of civilisation.

We call upon them to unite with us in a mighty effort to gain by all practicable means the political power.

In the meantime, and with a view to immediate improvement in the condition of labour, we present the following " Demands " :—

SOCIAL DEMANDS.

1. Reduction of the hours of labour in proportion to the progress of production.

2. The United States shall obtain possession of the railroads, canals, telegraphs, telephones, and all other means of public transportation and communication ; but no employee shall be discharged for political reasons.

3. The municipalities to obtain possession of the local railroads, ferries, waterworks, gasworks, electric plants, and all industries requiring municipal franchises ; but no employee shall be discharged for political reasons.

4. The public lands to be declared inalienable. Revocation of all land grants to corporations or individuals, the conditions of which have not been complied with.

5. Legal incorporation by the States of local trades unions which have no national organisation.

6. The United States to have the exclusive right to issue money.

7. Congressional legislation providing for the scientific management of forests and waterways, and prohibiting the waste of the natural resources of the country.

8. Inventions to be free to all ; the inventors to be remunerated by the nation.

9. Progressive income-tax and tax on inheritances ; the smaller incomes to be exempt.

10. School education of all children under fourteen years of age to be compulsory, gratuitous, and accessible to all by public assistance in meals, clothing, books, etc., where necessary.

11. Repeal of all pauper, tramp, conspiracy, and sumptuary laws. Unabridged right of combination.

12. Official statistics concerning the condition of labour. Prohibition of the employment of children of school age, and of the employment of female labour in occupations detrimental to health or morality. Abolition of the convict labour contract system.

13. Employment of the unemployed by the public authorities (county, ity, state, and nation).

14. All wages to be paid in lawful money of the United States. Equalisation of women's wages with those of men where equal service is performed.

15. Laws for the protection of life and limb in all occupations, and an efficient employers' liability law.

POLITICAL DEMANDS.

1. The people to have the right to propose laws and to vote upon all measures of importance, according to the referendum principle.

2. Abolition of the veto power of the executive (national, state, and municipal), wherever it exists.

3. Municipal self-government.

4. Direct vote and secret ballots in all elections. Universal and equal right of suffrage, without regard to colour, creed, or sex. Election days to be legal holidays. The principle of proportional representation to be introduced.

5. All public officers to be subject to recall by their respective constituencies.

6. Uniform civil and criminal law throughout the United States. Administration of justice to be free of charge. Abolition of capital punishment.

The forms of American Socialism thus far considered have been purely of European origin. We now come to a form purely American. In 1888 Mr. Edward Bellamy wrote his Socialistic novel *Looking Backward*, though never once using the name Socialism in the book. It fell, however, on soil prepared by the growing inequalities of American life, the development of gigantic monopolies, and the pressure of hard times. A sudden movement sprang up under the name of Nationalism. Clubs were started, first in Boston and then through all the country. Economically, Nationalism differed little from modern evolutionary State Socialism, except that it put especial emphasis upon the nation, as the social unit, and declined to be considered a class movement, or to have present international affiliations, though it looked forward to a future internationalism yet to be evolved. It aimed to be evolutionary American Socialism. Yet it is doubtful if it is more than one of the composing elements which will enter into the development of America's Socialism. As held and presented by its leaders, Edward Bellamy and Mr. N. A. Green, in Mr. Bellamy's organ, *The New Nation*, it took a strong evolutionary economic form ; but, as popularly conceived throughout the country, it was of too utopian a nature to bear abiding growth. Its organ, *The New Nation*, was suspended, January, 1894 ; and its many clubs are disappearing. It at first attempted some occasional independent political action, but has more recently as a political movement passed into the People's Party, which it has fairly honeycombed with Nationalism. It seems, therefore, that its function is to be the important one of the early utopian Socialism of Europe, in sowing seeds that, while the movement itself may pass away, will produce a substantial harvest of later scientific Socialism.

Christian Socialism in America dates in an organised form from about the same time as Nationalism, having been commenced in Boston by the Rev. W. D. P. Bliss. It, however, had already found partial expression in several writers, such as the Revs. J. H. Jones, Washington Gladden, Heber Newton, Prof. Ely, and others. As an organised movement it has had even less success than Nationalism ; but through its organ, *The Dawn*, has had a widespread influence in suggesting germs of thought which are springing up to-day in all branches of the Church all over the United States. (See our book soon to appear on *Christian Socialism.*)

Such is a brief review of the history of Socialism in America as an organised movement; but it is by no means a complete sketch of the development of American Socialistic thought. Wholly apart from the above movements must be noticed the very general spread of ideas largely Socialistic among the trades unionists on the one hand, and among American professors and students of political economy on the other, the latter coming mainly from contact with the German Historical School, or Socialists of the Chair. Academic Socialism has taken in the United States a more democratic form, and with much more emphasis upon the municipality than on the central government as the social unit. Its main leaders are Prof. Ely, now of the University of Wisconsin ; Prof. Adams, of Ann Arbor ; Prof. Bemis, of the University of Chicago ; Prof. James, of Pennsylvania ; Prof. Commons, of the University of Indiana, and others.

Though often called Socialists, these men are, however, not Socialists in the full sense. They argue for the nationalisation and municipalisation merely of all so-called natural monopolies, and thus accept a large portion of the Socialist programme; but they do not, for the present at least, accept the Socialist ideal of the socialisation of all land and capital. Nevertheless, they have done vast service by breaking down much of the prejudice against Socialism, by showing the practicability of the nationalisation and municipalisation of many departments of life, the impossibility of depending on competition in natural monopolies, the limitations of the old *laissez faire* ideal (see chapter xv.).

It must not be forgotten, too, that in the United States there is more Socialism in actual practical operation than many realise. The public schools and libraries, State universities, hospitals, asylums, reformatories, postal service, every court of justice, the signal service, coast surveys, the highway system, labour bureaux, municipal fire departments, every factory act, every municipal health regulation,—these and a hundred other things are purely Socialistic, and are rapidly on the increase.

Socialistic ideas, too, are quickly capturing all reform movements in the United States. At the last annual meeting of the American Federation of Labour, held in Chicago, December, 1894, the following significant programme was introduced, largely approved and referred to the various labour organisations for consideration :—

> *Whereas*, the trades unionists of Great Britain have, by the light of experience and the logic of progress, adopted the principle of independent labour politics as an auxiliary to their economic action ; and
>
> *Whereas*, such action has resulted in the most gratifying success ; and
>
> *Whereas*, such independent labour politics are based upon the following programme, to wit :—
>
> 1. Compulsory education ;
> 2. Direct legislation ;
> 3. A legal eight-hours work day ;
> 4. Sanitary inspection of workshop, mine, and home ;
> 5. Liability of employers for injury to health, body, or life ;
> 6. The abolition of the contract system in all public work ;
> 7. The abolition of the sweating system ;
> 8. The municipal ownership of street cars, and gas and electric plants for public distribution of light, heat, and power ;

9. The nationalisation of telegraphs, telephones, railroads, and mines;

10. The collective ownership by the people of all means of production and distribution;

11. The principle of the referendum in all legislation;

Therefore, Resolved, that this convention hereby endorses this political action of our British comrades; and

Resolved, that this programme and basis of a political labour movement be, and is hereby, submitted for the consideration of the labour organisations of America, with the request that their delegates to the next annual convention of the American Federation of Labour be instructed on this most important subject.

In most of the various labour organisations to which this programme was referred the Socialistic tenth plank has been rejected, though only after a spirited contest and for reasons of expediency, rather than because its opponents did not believe in it. The action is, therefore, deeply significant of the future. Even more thoroughly has the great People's Party, which at the last Presidential election in 1892 cast over 1,000,000 votes, and claims in 1894 to have cast 2,000,000 votes, become indoctrinated with Socialism. A party largely of the West and South, it has put its main emphasis upon monetary and greenback issues, yet more and more are its members coming to favour a complete Socialist programme. The Prohibition Party in the United States has also gone a long way towards the insertion of collective measures in its various State and national platforms. The main influence, however, that is working for the spread of Socialism in the United States is the rapid development of monopolies and a concentration of wealth, more rapid than in any other country of the world. The consolidation of railroads, for example, is so rapid that shrewd railroad men are declaring that relief can only be obtained in their nationalisation. The formation of Coal Trusts, Oil Trusts, Gas Trusts is working in the same way, so that it may be said that the main promoters of Socialism in America are not the Socialists, but the owners of the great monopolies, a condition of things which the great strikes like those at Homestead, Buffalo, Pullman, and elsewhere have done much to aid, especially when the present Government and the leaders of both the great political parties show themselves wholly on the side of capital. In England, Belgium, Germany, and Switzerland, Socialism bids fair to come in as a peaceful evolution. In the United States there is at present more danger of a bitter class war than in any other civilised country in the world. Its "constitutionalism" seems to prevent a slow evolution towards Socialism. The State in America can do nothing, not provided for by charters or constitutions, most difficult to change.

All powers not enumerated in constitution or in charter are reserved to the people, that is, to individuals. Democrat and Republican may contend for strict or for broader construction, but both agree that what is not or cannot be read into the constitution is illegal and unconstitutional. Back of Congress and above Congress is the sovereign State; back of the State and above the State is the town meeting; back of the town meeting and above the town meeting are—John Smith and Henry Jones, and Congress may do only what John Smith and Henry Jones have contracted to allow Congress to do. This theory of the social contract is wrought into the very warp and woof of the national life. It, more than aught else, makes America the least progressive of all civilised nations, the *bête noire* of all who would develop the social organism. The Government is not an organism, but a mechanism. It can do naught, because it has not the machinery, or rather because it has too much machinery. Is it proposed for the city to employ the unemployed, is Congress asked to attack the sweating system, the ardent reformer is told, not that the proposed action is unpractical, not that it is unjust, but that it is unconstitutional; it is "not so nominated in the bond". Over America to-day there hangs a dead hand, born of the autonomist, individual theory, that the State can only do that which sovereign and separate individuals have contracted that it may do.

Socialistic ideas among the people are spreading fast, but the constitution gives them no natural outlet. What the result will be, the most sanguine await with anxiety, but with little knowledge. The best authorities on Socialism in America are, for the earlier periods, Prof. Ely's *Labour Movement in America* and G.

E. M'Neill's *The Labour Movement.* For later periods, see the Report on the United States of the (English) Royal Commission on Labour. For American Socialist newspapers, see Appendix C. Information on all portions of the movement can be obtained in New York city at the office of *The People*, 189 William Street, at the Humboldt Publishing Company (headquarters also for literature of the People's Party), 19 Astor Place, and in Boston at the Equity Union, 20 Oak Street.

CHAPTER XI.

SOCIALISM IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND.

THE word Socialism in connection with Australasia must be used with the greatest care. The loose writer or reader, hearing of the extent of State railroads and of State action in the Australasian colonies, of the prevalence of the eight-hour day, and of the recent successes of the various Labour Parties in many of the colonies, is apt to call Australia a Socialist's paradise. Yet he is by this quite as apt to mislead as to state the truth ; for the Individualist, with only the slightest acquaintance with Australian conditions, can easily show that this Socialist paradise is anything but a workman's paradise. The fact is, that it is quite as true to say that there is no Socialism in Australia as that there is much. Either phrase is inexact. The truth is, that there is a great deal of Bourgeoise Collectivism and considerable Socialistic sentiment, but little more, unless it be recently in New Zealand. The Australian Governments do indeed own and conduct railroads and much that is in other countries left to private interests ; but the Governments are as yet either so in the hands of capitalists, or so filtered by capitalist theories and traditions, that their action is usually anything but Socialistic.

The State ownership of railroads in Australia has even tended to temporarily check the advance of true Socialism ; for capitalists, unable to invest and speculate in private railway shares, have in Australia through the banks invested more than in almost any portion of the world, unless it be the United States, in land speculations of every kind. Land booms have been the curse of Australian towns and cities. Threatened with ruin, the speculators have poured in more British capital, till when the crash came it was exceedingly great. This, too, has been largely increased by the monetary policy of the banks in connection with monometallism, contraction of the currency, etc. The building of so many new railroads, wharves, stations, etc., besides other public buildings, has given many of the colonies very large debts, which, while they have much to show for them, easily allows the critic to picture in gloomiest colours "the bad effects of Australian Socialism".

Thus viewed, it is easy to see that Australia suffers not because of its Socialism, but because of its lack of Socialism. Nevertheless, even as it is, Australia is in many ways in advance of the world. This is especially true as to the eight-hour movement and as to the success of her Labour Parties.

The first formal recognition of the eight-hour day took place in the settlement of Otago, in New Zealand, by the New Zealand Company, under the influence of the Rev. Thomas Burns. Its spread through Australia is largely due to the Victorian Operative Stonemasons' Society, who set the movement on foot in Melbourne in February, 1856. On April 21 a great demonstration was organised; and many firms granted the day, especially in the building trades. Gradually the movement spread into other trades, till the eight-hour day is now very frequent, though scarcely the rule; it needing legislation to make it general, and this in the different colonies is very varied. Industrial legislation is rapidly increasing, however, under the influence of the Labour Parties, which poll large votes in many of the colonies. In New South Wales numerous Labour candidates have recently been elected, and in New Zealand they can be said to have the control of the Lower House, four "Labour" peers, and the Ministry. The platforms of the Labour Parties vary in the different colonies, but are becoming in all more and more Socialistic, and in some colonies avowedly so, and supported as such by the Socialists. The "new unionism" is growing fast in Australia, largely due to the efforts of Mr. Spence, president of the Amalgamated Shearers' Union.

New Zealand is the most progressive of the Australasian colonies. September 9, 1893, the Legislative Council passed a measure conferring the Parliamentary franchise on women. In other respects it is equally progressive. In common with the other colonies, New Zealand suffered in 1893, owing to the bank panic, mainly caused by the conditions noted above, and the unemployed became very numerous. The Government, therefore, has commenced planting the unemployed on the land in co-operative colonies, and has also increased the land taxes, so as to break up the large estates.

For the benefit of working men an Employers' Liability Act was passed, granting full protection both as to wages and responsibility in case of injury. The Factories Act (1891) was a further protection, providing that no person under eighteen and no woman, except on half-holidays, shall be employed continuously more than four and a half hours without an interval of at least one half-hour for meals; and if meals are taken in factories, inspectors have full power to provide for ample light and room. Persons under sixteen are forbidden to work in factories, and the inspector may refuse to issue a certificate to those over that age if, in his judgment, the applicant is physically unfit to engage in such occupation.

The United States Consul at Auckland in a United States consular report for 1894 says:—

> Here the State is looked to to do almost everything. The State is expected to form roads and build bridges in the country, to find remunerative occupation for the unemployed, as well as to support asylums, hospitals, and charitable institutions for the aged, poor, and helpless members of society. It owns and operates the railways of the colony, the post-offices and telegraph and telephone lines, out of which there is made a considerable annual profit, that goes to swell the general revenue, thereby relieving taxation to that extent. There is also a Government life insurance department, which enters into spirited competition for business with both local and foreign companies. There is also a Government savings bank, which, with the insurance department, yields a handsome profit every year. All these profits are available to assist in defraying expenses of the Government.

Such is a general view of Australian Socialism. In 1893 the total debt of the Australian colonies was £200,000,000, of which nearly £113,000,000 was spent for railroads. With such large plant in Government hands and the working classes rapidly coming to control the Government, with the spread of Socialistic ideas as to both land and capital, Australia may certainly be called a land of Socialist hope. Since the great strike of 1890, commencing with the shearers and extending to all the shipping trades, the trades unions, which have always been strong in Australia, have become thoroughly alive to the necessity of political action on Socialist lines. Co-operation, profit sharing, and reactionary measures have little hold. Land nationalisation is becoming daily more popular. The suffrage, already wide in most of the colonies, will soon be absolutely universal. What is there to block genuine Socialism in Australia? Besides the Australian Labour Federation—popularly known as the A. L. F.—which is organised on a definite Socialist platform, there is an Australian Social Democratic Federation. In Queensland the Liberal Party in the Legislative Assembly has been practically extinguished by the Socialistic Labour Party. The *Worker*, the outspoken organ of the associated workers of Queensland, and which has for its motto, "Socialism in our time," claims that soon the whole labour movement in Australia will be led by the Socialists. In Melbourne and in other cities there is a growing number of Fabian Socialists.

For the facts as to Australian railroads, see Hole's *National Railways*. See also Dilke's *Problems of Greater Britain;* Report of the Royal Commission on Labour; and on New Zealand, see United States Consular Report by Consul J. D., at Auckland, New Zealand, for May, 1894; for the *Journal of the Department of Labour*, address, Edmund Frazer, Esq., of Wellington, New Zealand.

CHAPTER XII.

SOCIALISM IN OTHER COUNTRIES.

I. AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

(A) *Austria.*

SOCIALISM entered Austria from Germany, and took root among the German-speaking population. The following account of it is mainly abridged from the Foreign Report on Austria of the (English) Royal Commission on Labour. According to this, a *Viennese Working Men's Mutual Improvement Society* was started under the influence of Lassalle's agitation in 1867; and on Lassalle's birthday, April 11, 1869, it published the first number of the *Volkstimme.* At this date the society had twenty-six branches. In 1868 a Labour Congress was held, and in 1869 delegates were sent to the German Socialist Congress at Eisenach. The Government now prohibited all Socialist meetings, and the Socialist agitation had to be concentrated on the effort to obtain freedom of coalition and universal suffrage. In 1872 a Radical Labour Party was formed by a few dissentient members, while the members of the old Labour Party were called the Moderates. The Radicals favoured Federalism and the national aspirations of the Czechs, and worked with the Feudal Clerical Party, with whom they had nothing in common, save to defeat the Liberals. The Moderates worked with the Liberals, because they believed that nothing could be done for Socialism till the old priestly and feudal ascendancy was broken up. After the German laws against the Social Democrats were passed in 1878, the Austrian Socialists, in part, lost heart. The Radicals declared for Anarchism, and the Moderates for the Liberals. The Austrian

Christian Socialists (in the main) supported the Ministry of Count Taaffe, in legislative reforms. Between 1882 and 1884, too, the Anarchists attempted much violence in Austria; the Government resorted to strong measures, and the Socialist papers suffered much. Nevertheless, work went on, the trades unions became the camping grounds for the Socialists, and much propaganda was accomplished. From 1886 the movement has made steady progress. In 1888 the conference at Hainfeld, largely through the influence of Dr. Adler's paper, the *Gleichheit*, the Moderates, and those Radicals who were not Anarchists, came together.

This conference, which sat till January 1, 1889, was attended by representatives of all the divisions of the Austrian Labour Party, in the Slav and Romance, as well as in the German provinces of the empire. The programme or declaration of principles (*Prinzipienerklärung*) then drawn up, and accepted with only three dissentient voices, may be given in full, since it forms the best illustration of the attitude adopted by the new party. "With this declaration," says Herr Karl Kautsky, who himself took an active part in the conference, "the Austrian Labour Party again took up the position assumed by modern scientific Socialism, the same position which German Social Democracy has adopted."

The programme of the New Austrian Labour Party, as presented to the Hainfeld Conference, runs as follows:—

> The Social Democratic Labour Party in Austria aims at winning for the whole people, without distinction of nationality, race, or sex, freedom from the fetters of economic dependence, abolition of political disqualifications (*Rechtslosigkeit*), and deliverance from intellectual degradation (*geistige Verkümmerung*). The cause of the present unsatisfactory conditions is not to be sought in isolated political provisions, but in the fact which moulds and governs the whole state of society, that the instruments of labour (*Arbeitsmittel*) are monopolised by a few proprietors (*Besitzender*). The working classes, who have the power to labour, thus become the slaves of the capitalist class, who possess the instruments of labour, and whose political and economic supremacy finds expression in the modern State. Private ownership of the instruments of production, which indicates politically a State founded on class distinctions (*Klassenstaat*), signi-

fies economically the increasing poverty of the masses (*Massenarmuth*), and the growing degradation of ever-widening sections of the population (*Volksschichte*).

The party thus, as was recognised in the speeches which followed the introduction of the programme, began by adopting the standpoint of Karl Marx, and recognising that a certain social and economic development must precede the full acceptance of Socialist principles.

The industrial programme adopted included the following points :—

1. Full freedom of coalition and legal recognition of discussions about wages and the formation of " clubs " (*Cartelle*) among workmen.
2. A maximum eight hours' working day, without exceptions or conditions.
3. Prohibition of night work (except in those factories where it is rendered necessary by the technical nature of the trade).
4. An uninterrupted weekly rest from Saturday evening to Monday morning.
5. Prohibition of the employment of children under fourteen years of age.
6. Exclusion of the labour of women from all trades which are specially injurious to them.
7. Extension of these provisions to all industries (large manufactories, industries connected with transport, handicrafts, and home industries).
8. Employers failing to observe these provisions to be punished with imprisonment.
9. Local or special (*fachlich*) workmen's associations to help in carrying out the Industrial Code by means of inspectors elected by them. The Industrial Code to be established on an international basis, and extended in a specialised form to the agricultural labourers.

The Hainfeld Conference gave the Austrian Labour Party a compact organisation and a definite plan of action, and its effects were soon felt in the rapid advance made by the Social Democratic movement. The Socialist papers obtained a wider circulation, meetings for the propagation of Socialist doctrines were held, and many new workmen's associations were founded. The political and economic conditions of the time further favoured this development. In 1889 the Liberal Party in the Government appointed a committee to inquire into the advisability of establishing Labour Chambers (*Arbeiterkammern*) in Austria. Although this committee had no practical result, as far as its immediate object was concerned, it appears to have brought together a large number of workmen from all parts of the empire, and to have thus indirectly helped on the cause of Social Democracy by acting as an international Austrian conference on a small scale.

Strikes and agitation became common, and the Government again tried repression. Papers were suppressed, and the editors of the *Gleichheit* arrested on charges of Anarchism. Nevertheless, a second general congress was held at Vienna, June 28-30, 1891.

According to the report presented by the Austrian Social Democrats to the International Congress held at Zurich in July, 1893, the events of the second conference of Vienna convinced the Austrian bureaucracy that the existence of a powerful and determined Social Democratic organisation among the working classes could not be ignored, and, recognising this fact, the authorities permitted the resolutions of the conference to be quietly carried out, and a united Social Democratic Party to be formed, which, while it did not disregard national characteristics, and allowed full independence within the limits of the general party programme to the Polish and Czech members, remained nevertheless "strictly international" in its organisation (*streng international organisirt*).

The winter of 1892 was marked in Austria by agitation on the part of the Social Democrats against the censorship of the press, which was so far successful that the House of Deputies appointed a special committee to consider a scheme for reforming the press laws.

The early months of 1893 saw the opening of "a campaign in favour of universal, equal, and direct suffrage," which was maintained until the autumn session of Parliament. In April a somewhat universal suffrage was gained in Belgium, and the victory of the Belgian workmen was hailed by the Austrian Social Democrats as an earnest of their own future success.

It was under these circumstances that the May Day celebrations of 1893 took place throughout the empire, and they developed into a gigantic demonstration, not for the eight-hour day only, but also for the suffrage. In Vienna 150,000 men and women marched in military order through the streets; and, what had never before happened, before the palaces of the nobility, in the imperial courts themselves, the cry was heard: "Long live the International Social Democracy!" "Three cheers for the eight-hour day!" "Three cheers for universal suffrage!" A few weeks later, the political victories gained by the German Social Democracy at the ballot-box were celebrated throughout the empire in a series of magnificent meetings, at all of which the pledge was taken to do battle for the suffrage. In July 500,000 working men and women gathered in the very heart of Vienna, and declared they would neither rest nor be deterred by any sacrifice until they had won.

On October 10 Count Taaffe introduced his bill, practically granting universal suffrage. Nevertheless, although by the provisions of the new bill the number of voters in Austria would be doubled, the Social Democrats would only agree to accept it as a move in the right direction. This was the attitude consistently maintained in the various meetings of the working classes which followed on the introduction of Count Taaffe's scheme; and when the German Liberals, the Feudal Clericals, and the Poles, representing respectively the *bourgeoisie*, the landed interest, and the "National" Party, combined to oppose the bill and to bring about the resignation of the Ministry, a resolution was adopted in various Socialist meetings in Vienna, including a gathering of working women, to the effect that the Social Democratic Party "condemned the action of the three large Parliamentary groups in the matter of electoral reform, and declared that the alliance of the reactionary parties did not intimidate the working classes, and that the movement in favour of general, equal, and direct suffrage, which was led by the Social Democrats, would not be impeded or delayed thereby". At the same time, Dr. Adler, the leader of the party, stated that the Social Democrats would "heartily welcome the new constellation in the political heavens, seeing that it at last united all the propertied and privileged classes against the onslaught of the proletariat," and that "now the brawls and squabbles of the nationalities would cease, and the war of classes would begin". The subject of the suffrage is now the principal one before the Austrian Parliament.

Other evidences of the progress made by the agitation of the Social Democracy are the formation of numerous political clubs and the strength of their press. At present the party owns thirteen German, eight Czech, and two Polish political papers, exclusive of trade journals. These papers are all weeklies and semi-weeklies, and their circulation grows rapidly. The *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, published in Vienna, has an edition of 19,000, the edition of the Vienna *Volks-Tribune* is 9000, the circulation of the *Arbeiterinnen-Zeitung* (female workers' paper) is 4000. The birth and growth of this last paper, in 1892, is one of the best signs of progress.

The great obstacle to the spread of Socialism in Austria is the presence of the Anarchists, with whom the Socialists are continually confounded by the Government, though the two parties are now completely distinct. For a notice of the somewhat important Christian Socialist movement in Austria, see our book to appear on *Christian Socialism.*

For the best English account of Austrian Socialism, see the Foreign Report on Austria of the (English) Royal Commission on Labour. All details can be learned by addressing the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, 6 Kopernikusgasse, Vienna, the organ of the Austrian Socialists or the *Volks-Buchhandlung*, 8 Gumpendor Strasse, the headquarters for Socialist literature in Vienna.

(B) *Hungary.*

Socialism entered Hungary in 1867, but a Workmen's Union on Socialist lines was only formed in 1870. Congresses were held in 1881 and 1882, but not much was accomplished till the International Workmen's Congress of 1889 in Paris gave Socialism a fresh impetus. The poet Krasser popularised the movement, and it has had many devoted leaders. There are, however, many divisions, and two Socialist parties.

At the congress in Buda-Pesth, however, of January 6-8, 1893, sixty delegates were present who belonged to the capital, and thirty-three were from the provinces, of whom two came from Croatia. At this congress the tactics and programme of the Austrian Congress at Hainfeld were adopted. A resolution was agreed to for the celebration of May Day, and the political and economic independence of the worker was asserted as a principle; a discussion of the grievances of the agricultural labourer followed. May Day was subsequently celebrated with considerable vigour; especially in the chief towns of Croatia, large meetings were held. The official report to the Zurich Congress of 1893 states that since the January congress a new life had entered into the movement, which was being actively manifested in strikes for higher wages and the foundation of new press organs.

II. THE BALKAN STATES.

Concerning Socialism in the Balkan States, the (English) Foreign Labour Report on Austria-Hungary and the Balkan States says :—

(A) *Servia.*

The history of Servian Socialism goes back to the year 1870, when a young Servian, Stephan Draguica, published his work on "Communisme individualiste" at Geneva.

The chief principles advocated in this book were the nationalisation of land, the abolition of inheritance, and the development of public education. This work had no effect on Servia, though it attracted some attention in Western Europe, and it was reserved for Russia to send the message of Socialism to the Balkan peninsula. At first the new ideas brought from the University of St. Petersburg were entirely confined to groups of students and others belonging to the educated classes. The leadership of the party was assumed by Svetosar Markovitch, whose works on social subjects published at Zurich had already attracted the attention of the Servian Government, and had caused it to withdraw the scholarship which enabled him to study at the polytechnicum. The first Servian Socialist newspaper, the *Radnik* (workman), was founded by him, and under his influence the existing clubs for the study of social science doubled their numbers. The *Radnik* was, however, soon condemned by the Government, and its editor sentenced to four years' imprisonment. Markovitch succeeded, however, in making his escape, and spent the period of his exile in spreading the propaganda of his party in Bulgaria, Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Montenegro.

On his return to Servia he started another newspaper, the *Jawnost* (publicity), and formulated a political and social programme. The political programme opened with the declaration that the existing central Government was to be abolished by a decision of the National Assembly, and to be replaced by a committee of delegates from the departments. The existing judicial system was also to be replaced by a board of arbitration. The social side of the programme included the abolition of debts on landed property, and forbade any person to possess land unless he cultivated it himself. The aim to which these reforms tended was the appropriation of all land by the communes.

This programme was well suited to the circumstances of the people, and the party gained adherents among all classes. Two new papers were started, and in the elections of 1874 four Socialist representatives were returned to Parliament, besides fifteen Democrats who had accepted the practical part of the Socialist programme. The death of Markovitch, which followed these successes, did not in any wise diminish the ardour of the party, and fresh successes followed in the elections of 1876. The Government had hitherto made many apparent concessions, but now it roused itself to vigour, and a Socialist insurrection, which took place on the dissolution of Parliament in 1883, was suppressed by force of arms. The rebels were shot, their leaders imprisoned, and the whole party still suffers from the effects of the blow it experienced.

(B) *Roumania.*

Socialism was first introduced into Roumania in the year 1875 by Subko Kodreanu, a student who then returned to Jassy from St. Petersburg, where he had imbibed the principles of the chief Russian Socialists. A small body of young men, trained chiefly in the school of French Socialism, gathered round him. A Socialist society was immediately formed at Jassy, whose first act was a commemoration of the Paris Commune. Shortly after the foundation of the society Kodreanu died, but the untimely death of their leader was powerless to discourage his followers. Public Socialist meetings were held and a newspaper founded, which, however, was quickly suppressed by the Russian Government. New papers followed and were again suppressed, until in 1884 the *Socialist Review*, a monthly journal, which dealt with the works of Socialist writers in Western Europe, succeeded in maintaining a permanent existence. Three years later the party was firmly enough established to formulate a definite political programme, which is well adapted to attract the sympathies of a nation which owes so much of its present poverty to an unfortunate system of land tenure.

The report of the Roumanian Socialists made to the International Socialist Congress held at Zurich in 1893 states that the party is now chiefly occupied with agrarian reform, with the organisation of trades unions (*Gewerkschaftsorganisation*), and in organising the Jewish proletariat of Moldavia. The first national Socialist congress took place at Bucharest on April 13, 1893, at which a general council of five members was chosen, who were to be elected each year by the congress, and were to be entrusted with the leadership of party matters. A new programme for the Social Democratic Labour Party was also drawn up and approved. This programme treats of universal suffrage, protective legislation for the working classes and the agrarian question. The chief agrarian reform demanded is the gradual repurchase by the State of all large private properties which are to form an inalienable domain to be cultivated by the peasantry under a form of communal co-operation.

(c) *Bulgaria.*

The Socialist movement in Bulgaria, introduced by students from foreign universities, found ready acceptance amongst the industrial population. In 1891 a regular Social Democratic Party was constituted, and a national congress was held at Tirnova in April of the same year. At a second congress, held later on in the year, the programme of the party was adopted, and rules for its organisation approved. In 1892 a third congress, held at Philippopolis, decided to start a newspaper, the *Rabotnik* (workman), which, in 1893, had a circulation of about 1200 copies. The translation of the works of Russian, French, and German Socialists forms an important part of the propaganda of the party. Sixteen such books have been published since 1891. May Day celebrations have also been started in several towns, and, in the opinion of these Socialist leaders, these demonstrations form a valuable means of advertising the existence of the party.

III. DENMARK.

Except for a few previous writers, Socialism was introduced into Denmark in 1871 by Harald Brix, Paul Geleff, and Louis Pio, who started a paper, held meetings, and founded sections of the International. The movement, however, was nearly broken up by the police and the leaders imprisoned. Yet, in 1876, a congress at Copenhagen met with seventy-five delegates from fifty-five organisations, numbering 5500 members. In 1878 a Social Democratic Society was formed of widespread influence. In 1883 the German Socialist Congress was held at Copenhagen, and gave the movement a great impetus. In 1889 the Socialists were able to return two delegates, Holm and Hördun, to the *Folkething*, and in 1886 to take part, 80,000 strong, in the Copenhagen procession to commemorate the Constitution. The Socialists have five journals, one daily, the *Social Demokratin*, of Copenhagen, having a circulation of 26,000. In 1893 the Danish report to the Zurich Congress claimed 35,000 paying members. The party is represented by two members in the *Folkething* (Commons) and two in the *Landsthing* (Senate). It has two members on the Copenhagen Council and one in that of Helsingor. It owns three club-houses, in Copenhagen, Aarhus, and Helsingor. Moku, Mourdun, Jensen, and Petersen are among their leading men. Their programme is similar to that of the German Socialists.

IV. HOLLAND.

Socialism first entered Holland in 1869, when a branch of the International was founded at Amsterdam, and a Socialist paper, the *Standaard des Volks*, was started. In 1872 the famous congress of the International, at which the final separation of the Anarchists and Socialists took place, was held at the Hague. Yet little progress was made till Domela Nieuwenhuis, a former clergyman, declared for Socialism, and in 1879 founded his paper, the *Recht voor Allen*, a vigorous weekly, which has now become a daily. In 1887 he was imprisoned for political reasons, but in 1888 was elected to the Legislature, and in 1889 founded a Social Democratic League.

Among the principal objects set forth in the programme of the league may be mentioned :—

Legislation directly by the people.
Separation of Church and State.

Establishment of free, compulsory, secular education.

Abolition of the capitalist, and organisation of labour by the people (*volksweerbarheit*).

The means by which the league proposes to realise its objects are threefold:—

1. The propaganda and discussion of Socialist ideas by means of books, papers, meetings, etc.
2. The organisation of labour and intervention in conflicts between capital and labour.
3. The support of political agitation, and especially of the demand for universal suffrage (*kies-en stemrecht*).

Co-operation was one of the agencies employed by the league in its earlier years; and a bakery, shoe shop, and coal store are still carried on at the Hague, with profits which, in 1889, amounted to 30,000 florins. The co-operative principle is now, however, discredited, as being an attempt to reconcile labour and capital, which is regarded by Socialists as impossible.

The official centre of the league is at the Hague, and it has many adherents in Amsterdam also, but its stronghold is to be found in the northern provinces of Friesland and Groningen, which have been the chief scene of Mr. Domela Nieuwenhuis's activity. A Socialist society has been formed by railway servants, which now includes 2000 members, and a Socialist union for teachers is said to flourish.

Among the chief local organs for the spread of Socialist opinions may be mentioned *Het radicaal Weekblad* (the Radical weekly) at Amsterdam, *De Klok* (the bell) at Wolvega in Friesland, *Het Friesche Volksblad* (the Frisian people's paper) at Leeuwarden, and several trade journals, such as the *Cigarmaker*, the *Carpenter*, and the *Signal* (*Seingever*), the organ of the Railway Servants' Society.

Socialism, however, has not spread very rapidly in Holland; partly on account of the stolid character of the people; partly because co-operation in Holland has temporarily covered the ground; partly because the clergy, Catholic and Protestant, have taken more interest in moderate social advance than in most other countries; largely because the Socialism that has been introduced is of the Anarchist type, Mr. Nieuwenhuis himself having recently developed into almost Anarchist views, and coming into conflict with the majority of his party who believe in the German programme of political action.

V. ITALY.

Socialism first entered Italy, as so many European countries, in connection with the International. An Italian representative was at the second congress of the International at Lausanne in 1867, and in the same year Bakunin founded a "section" at Naples, and started a paper, the *Equality*. Other sections were organised at Milan, Genoa, and in Sicily. In 1871 the movement was considered sufficiently dangerous to be suppressed by the Government. The society, however, soon sprang up again, starting a new paper, *La Campana*, and was especially active in Romagna and Tuscany. It opposed and was opposed by the Mazzini Republicans, but was aided by the followers of Garibaldi. In Tuscany the scattered groups founded a *Workman's Union*. Again, however, the Government tried to break up the movement, and several of the leaders were arrested. The Internationalists, however, held another congress at Bologna, and declared themselves to be Anarchists, Atheists, Materialists, and Federalists. The police broke up the meeting, but the movement went on. Bad harvests in 1874 produced much distress, and the Internationalists stirred up many strikes and scattered much inflammatory literature, till the police broke up all democratic societies, and the International was finally dissolved. It had become, however, a society not of Socialists, but of Anarchists. Socialism was to reappear in purer forms.

In Italy there had already been several attempts at uniting working men's unions into one great organisation. In 1861 a *Fratellanza Artigiana* (artisan brotherhood) was started at Florence, under the influence of Mazzini. Political jealousies prevented its becoming universal, but it still exists at Florence, with 3000 members, a large co-operative undertaking, and a library of 1000 vols., with many other interesting features. In 1871 delegates of working men met at Rome, and formed a fraternal pact (*Patto di Fratellanza*). It too still exists, embracing 600 societies, and held its eighteenth general congress at Palermo in 1892. Politically, it also stood with Mazzini.

In 1882 the Italian Franchise was widened, and in 1885 an Italian Labour Party was formed at Milan, partly Socialistic, partly Anarchistic. It won strength enough to cause it to be dissolved by the Government in 1886. A new labourers' party (*Partito dei Lavoratori*), however, was formed at congresses in Milan and Genoa in 1891 and 1892. Its programme is summarised as follows :—

> Two classes only exist in modern society, the proletariat and the capitalist. All human beings, provided that they contribute according to their strength, to create and maintain the benefits of social life, have a right to share in them. The redemption of the proletariat or wage-earning class can only be effected by the nationalisation of the factors of labour (land, mines, factories, railways, etc.), and by a common administration of production. To enable this end to be obtained the proletariat must be organised as an independent class party, developing its action under a double aspect.
>
> 1. As an industrial contest for the immediate improvement of the condition of the working class (working hours, wages, regulations of factories, etc.), committed to the labour chambers and other associations of crafts and trades.
>
> 2. As a movement of a more extended nature, intended to acquire political power (State, communes, public administrations, etc.), which is no longer to be used as an instrument of pauperisation and of oppression, but as a means of obtaining the economic and political expropriation of the dominant class.
>
> In carrying out the second part of the programme the assistance of all friends of the proletariat, although they do not belong to its ranks, is willingly accepted.

Says the Report on Italy of the (English) Royal Commission on Labour :—

> The party unites under its statutes all the federations and societies, rural or urban, that fully adhere to its programme. All trade societies are, as far as possible, to be organised in sections of crafts and trades.

The collective action of the party is developed by means of a general congress to be held from time to time, as occasion requires, of regional congresses for local interests, and of a central committee, composed of seven members, who are invested with the executive power, and remain in office from one general congress to another. There is also an international secretary, by whom the relations with foreign labour parties are to be maintained.

In September, 1893, the party held a second congress at Reggio (Emilia), when it assumed a distinctly Socialist attitude, and adopted the name of "Italian Labourers' Socialist Party" (*Partito Socialista dei Lavoratori Italiani*). The reports of the central committee to this congress and to the International Congress at Zurich (1893) give some further interesting details concerning the development and present position of the party, which may be added to the above account. Owing to the remissness of the affiliated societies in furnishing the committee with returns, it has not been found possible to publish perfectly satisfactory statistics, but it is probable that the party includes at the present time not less than 200,000 active members, and almost 300 affiliated societies, among them the agricultural federations of Mantua, with about 11,000 peasant members. Several new societies have been founded, and federations have been established in various districts, particularly in Piedmont and Tuscany, and a few local conferences have been held. Support, moral and material, has been given to workmen on strike, including the spinners of Bergamo and Cremona, the Sicilian peasants, the miners of Carmaux, and the English miners (September, 1893), while the general demonstrations which took place among Italian workmen on May 1, 1893, appear also to be largely due to the action of the *Partito dei Lavoratori*.

As the events of the Congresses of Genoa, Palermo, and Reggio show, considerable jealousy still exists between the Socialists and Anarchists, while the old opposition of the Republicans to the Socialists, which dates back to the days of Mazzini, has not yet entirely died out. In spite of internal dissensions, however, the Labour Party shows a general tendency to develop on Socialist lines, and to treat strictly party questions as of secondary importance while aiming at the acquisition of political power as a means of carrying through social reforms.

The strength of the labour movement, in which the rural population has now begun to take part, is to be found in the most industrial regions of the kingdom. That it is extending to other parts may be deduced from the fact that a Sicilian federation of recent origin, the *Fascio dei Lavoratori* (Labour Union), had, in the course of a few months, obtained about 8000 adherents.

One important development of the social movement in Italy is the establishment of Labour Chambers.

"The agitation," writes Sir Dominic Colnaghi in his report upon Italy for 1893, "which began nearly four years ago, in favour of the establishment of Labour Chambers or Exchanges in Italy, has been so far successful that Chambers have been provided at Milan, Turin, Piacenza, Micerata, Venice, and Bologna ; while at Rome, Genoa, Florence, Verona, Brescia, Pavia, Spezia, and Como active steps are being taken towards their organisation, with, however, varying success. In other centres, also, preparatory committees are stated to have been formed to study and promote the same object." The report of the Central Committee of the *Partito dei Lavoratori* to the Zurich International Congress mentions further that Labour Chambers have been started at Parma, Cremona, and Padua, while efforts are being made to found others at Naples and at Bergamo.

The chambers aim at :—

1. The organisation of the working classes in sections according to their different trades.

2. The promotion of the technical and general education of the operatives.

3. The formation of committees of arbitration for the settlement of disputes between employers and employed.

They also act as labour registries, and procure work for the unemployed. At present they confine themselves to industrial functions, and do not concern themselves with political questions. "But if, with the advance of the labour movement, greater power should be thrown into their hands, it may become doubtful how long this position of political neutrality will, or perhaps can, be maintained." Indeed, the programme of the *Partito dei Lavoratori* shows that they are already beginning to desire political power.

The Labour Chamber of Milan is by far the most important of those already established. In March and April, 1890, the various working men's associations of Milan discussed and approved the statutes of a proposed labour exchange, to be composed of all the Milanese societies that gave in their adhesion, formed in separate sections of crafts and trades. The matter was referred to a committee, and, among other points, the question was discussed whether it would be advisable for the Municipal Council of Milan to encourage the foundation of a labour exchange in the city. The committee viewed the establishment of the exchange with favour. On their proposal the municipality granted a subsidy of 15,000 lire, to be voted annually, and placed at the disposal of the exchange a wing of the castle, containing about eighty rooms and a large hall.

The proposed Labour Chamber was actually started at Milan towards the end of September, 1891.

The recent attempt of the Italian government to put down all Socialistic organisations, and even trades unions, may not even retard the movement more than temporarily. The seed is too deeply sown. The organ of the Italian Socialist Party is the *Sotta di Classe*, published weekly at 16 Via S. Pietro all 'Orto, Milan.

VI. NORWAY AND SWEDEN.

Socialism here has made little headway. Attempts were made to introduce it in 1873 by Danish Socialists, and a society of thirty-seven members was founded in Christiania, but it slowly died. In 1883 another Social Democratic Club was founded in the same city, and by 1887 a Social Democratic Congress was held at Arendal. In 1888 there were four Socialist newspapers in Sweden, but three were soon suspended by the Government and their editors imprisoned. In May, 1889, the first Socialist congress was held in Sweden, delegates appearing from twenty-nine unions, and since then there has been a growing Socialist vote. The country is, however, not yet ripe for advanced action. Capitalism is comparatively little developed, only fifteen per cent. of the population live in cities, while the industrial development is backward; so that there is comparatively little field for Socialism. Sweden has one strong Socialist organ, the *Sozial Demokrat*. In Norway a (Socialistic) Labour Party was formed in 1887, and in 1893 claimed 6000 members.

VII. RUSSIA.

There may be said to be no Socialism in Russia. The despotic government of that country has compelled the revolutionary spirit to be political more than industrial, and has consequently developed Nihilism and Anarchism, but not Socialism. It is not without meaning that both the founder and the present main leader of Anarchism in Europe, Bakunin and Peter Kropotkine, are Russians, with a bitter experience of Russian despotism. Some of the present Russian revolutionists living in foreign countries are said to be coming to Socialist views, but as yet the time for Socialism has not come in Russia.

VIII. SPAIN AND PORTUGAL.

Socialism was introduced into Spain by the International in 1868, and found a ready response. In 1873 it had in Spain 674 branches, with upwards of 300,000 members, found in industrial centres like Barcelona, and in islands like Majorca. M. de Laveleye says that the early meetings were usually held in churches, where, at white heat, the orators denounced God, religion, and the priests, as vehemently as capital, private property, and the State. It was Anarchistic more than Socialistic, and when the split in the International came in 1872 the Spanish members sided with Bakunin and the Anarchists. So they have had thus far the controlling influence in the Spanish social movement; but in 1882 a Social Democratic Labour Party was formed, on Marxian lines, demanding (1) the acquisition of political power, (2) the transformation of all private and corporate property into the common property of the nation, and (3) the reorganisation of society on the basis of industrial associations. Spanish Socialism takes the federal communal form. This is in sympathy with the national tendency. Castelar declares the Federal Republic to be the most perfect form of State, though as yet impracticable, and the communes in Spain are strongly developed, there being much communal property. This tends to make even Socialism in Spain little centralised, and causes present weakness, while it will probably mean ultimate gain. The Socialist propaganda, too, has met many difficulties, partly from being confused with Anarchism, although it is attacked by the Anarchists. These Anarchists, however, still largely sway the social movement. In 1881 they reconstituted the Spanish Federation of the International Working Men's Association, and carried on a large though secret propaganda. They have committed many deeds of violence, but disclaim all connection with the celebrated Andalusian Society of the Black Hand. Nevertheless, it can at once be seen how they prejudice men against all social reform. Deeds like those of Pallas at Barcelona and Socialism do not go together. Nevertheless, Socialism is growing.

In 1888 there was organised a General Union of Working Men in Spain, which is largely Socialistic. Commencing with 29 societies and 3355 members in 1888, it has now 112 societies and 8941 members, and holds biennial congresses. It is in correspondence with the European Socialist movement, and organises effective demonstrations on the first of May. The Socialist Party proper consists of fifty groups, and in 1892 cast 7000 votes. Its main leader is Señor Pablo Iglesias, a compositor, of Madrid.

For all these different countries the best books in English are Rae's *Contemporary Socialism* and the Foreign Reports of the Royal Commission on Labour, though both must be read with the consciousness that, though meaning to be fair, neither of these accounts are written in sympathy with the movement.

CHAPTER XIII.

SOCIALISM AND THE POLITICAL ECONOMISTS.

THOSE who have not followed the recent drift of Political Economy have little idea how changed is the tone in regard to Socialism. Says Prof. de Laveleye: "It was at one time imagined that the means of combating Socialism would be found in the teachings of Political Economy; but, on the contrary, it is precisely this science which has furnished the Socialists of to-day with their most redoubtable weapons" (Introduction to *Contemporary Socialism*). Says Mr. Kidd, speaking of Political Economy (*Social Evolution*, p. 24): "We have evidence of a wide-reaching change which is now in progress in England". Says Prof. Marshall (*Principles of Economics*, vol. i., p. 64): "This change in the point of view of economics is partly due to the influence of Socialists and others". We propose, therefore, mainly by quotations from some political economists themselves, to show what this change is. It can be easily exaggerated and also minimised.

JOHN STUART MILL.

We commence with Mill. His *Principles of Political Economy*, published in 1848, is usually considered the highest expression of the orthodox political economy, but it belongs almost as much to the new as to the old. In it the science becomes not the development of *a priori* theories, but a practical study how to meet the problems of the day, the consideration of how the working classes may improve their condition, etc., etc., and many of the answers are most advanced in their view. Mill himself even came to class himself as a Socialist. He says in his Autobiography, speaking of himself and his wife: "Our ideal of ultimate improvement went far beyond Democracy, and would class us decidedly under the general name of Socialists. . . . The social problem of the future we considered to be, how to unite the greatest individual liberty of action with a common ownership in the raw material of the globe, and an equal participation of all the benefits of combined labour."

KATHEDER SOZIALISTEN (SOCIALISTS OF THE CHAIR).

If Mill was the first orthodox Political Economist to declare at all for explicit Socialism, the first actual school of Economists to move in this direction was in Germany. These were the *Katheder Sozialisten* (Academic Socialists, or Socialists of the Chair), a name first applied to them in mockery by Herr Offenheim in the *National Zeitung* in 1871, and later accepted by Prof. Schmoller in the opening address on the occasion of their gathering at Eisenach in 1872. This meeting proving a success, and evidencing that many German economists were coming to the new thought, a permanent organisation was formed in 1873, the *Verein für Sozial Politik* (the Social Economic Club), which has held meetings almost every year since.

According to Lange, one of the earliest of these Academic Socialists, the main principle of the preceding "Manchester school" was the restriction of State interference within the narrowest bounds, from which followed the doctrine of free trade as an indispensable condition of national wealth and the doctrine of freedom of migration. To the working classes it was pointed out that by the exercise of intelligence and self-control they might materially improve their condition, and that it was possible for each individual to work his way up into the ranks of the employers. On the other hand, the Economists, called by Von Schonberg the "party of social reform," maintained, against the Manchester school, the "absolute necessity of a positive and far-reaching policy of interference on the part of the State with the object of promoting the welfare of the labouring classes," and against Socialism, "the principle that the individual is mainly responsible for his economic status, and that the State should only intervene to supplement the efforts of individual, class, or society, when those efforts alone would not suffice to obtain the desired and desirable economic and moral conditions ".

Says Prof. de Laveleye (in his *Contemporary Socialism*), the Socialists of the Chair, " like all Socialists, admit, in the first place, that the distribution of wealth ought to be regulated more than it is by principles of equity, and in particular that the labourers ought to receive a larger share ; and, secondly, that this result cannot be obtained as the effect of liberty and what are called natural laws, but only through the action of the Legislature and the State ". . . . They blame orthodox Economists for confining themselves too exclusively to questions touching the production of wealth, and for having neglected those concerning its distribution and consumption.

> They hold that it has been a mistake to investigate economical problems from an isolated standpoint; they are closely connected with psychology, religion, morals, law, customs, and history. It is necessary to take all these elements into account, and not to be contented with the uniform and superficial formula of *laissez faire.* The class antagonism, which has been from all time at the bottom of political revolutions, reappears to-day with more serious features than ever. It seems to imperil the future of civilisation. There is no use in denying the evil; it is far better to study it under all its forms, and to endeavour to apply a remedy to it by means of successive and rational reforms. It is to morals, to the sentiment of justice, and to Christian charity that we must look for inspiration. Political Economy ought to be an ethical science.
>
> The Socialists of the Chair differ altogether from the old school in their view of the nature and limits of the right of property. The orthodox Economists speak of " property " as if it were an absolute right, perfectly defined and always identical. The new Economists assert, on the contrary, that this right has assumed very different forms in relation to the modes of production of each epoch ; that in like manner it is called upon to undergo new changes ; that it can never be considered as absolute, since it exists only in the general interest ; and that, consequently, it should be subjected to such limitations and forms as the progress of civilisation, which is the purpose of its existence, may from time to time require.

Under this general position very various shades of opinion are represented in the school. Prof. Schmoller, in his opening address at Eisenach, said:—

> "The marked division of classes in the midst of existing society, the open war between masters and workmen, between owners and proletarians, and the danger, still distant but threatening the future, of a social revolution, have for some years caused doubts to arise as to the truth and definitive triumph of the economic doctrines represented by the congress of Economists; and on all sides it is questioned whether absolute freedom of labour and the complete abolition of the antiquated regulations of the Middle Ages will bring about that perfectly happy situation which the believers in *laissez faire* have so enthusiastically predicted". While thus separating himself from the old optimism of the Manchester party (*Das Manchesterthum*), Schmoller was careful to show that he did not accept the conclusions of the Socialists. "Though by no means satisfied," he said, "with existing social conditions, and convinced of the necessity of reforms, we preach neither the upsetting of science nor the overthrow of the existing social order, and we protest against all Socialistic experiments. All the great advances shown in history have been the results of the work of ages. The existing economic legislation, the present methods of production, the psychological conditions of the different classes, ought to be the basis of our reforming energy. We demand neither the abolition of industrial freedom nor the suppression of the wage system; but we do not wish, out of respect for abstract principles, to allow the most crying abuses to become daily worse, and to permit so-called freedom of contract to end in the actual exploitation of the labourer. We do not desire the State to advance money to working men in order that they may make experiments on systems inevitably destined to fail; but we demand that it should concern itself, in an altogether new spirit, with their instruction and training, and should see that labour is not conducted under conditions which must have for their inevitable effect the degradation of the labourer."

Wagner would go far in limiting property in ground rents in towns. Samler is alone in advocating the nationalisation of land. Held calls himself a Socialist because of the two forces, Socialism and Individualism, which society always needs; we need to-day more Socialism.

"On the whole," says the Report on Germany of the (English) Royal Commission on Labour, "the Academic Socialists represent the moderate party, whether in politics or in social science, the party which, while recognising the value of State intervention, recognises also that 'self-help' is an absolutely indispensable condition of economic progress, and to these two principles adds a third, that of the aid of society (*Gesellschaftshilfe*) or 'the free exercise of the beneficent and educating influence which belongs to the cultivated classes'."

This last principle is given especial prominence by the younger and contemporary school of Academic Socialists, represented by such names as Dr. Herkner, Dr. von Schulze-Gavernitz, Dr. Max Sering, Herr Gohre, Prof. von Philippovich and others, and in more or less close conjunction with the later developments of Protestant Christian Socialism (*Evangelischsozialisten*).

The leaders of the original movement included such names, besides those already mentioned, as Roscher, who is credited with suggesting the movement; Brentano, the author of the famous work on the Guilds; Nasse, of Berlin; Hildebrand, of Jura; Knies, of Heidelberg; Conrad, of Halle; and many more statesmen and officials, as well as professors—150 in all.

These *Katheder Sozialisten* are thus not Democratic Socialists, and have no connection with the actual German Socialist movement. The actual reforms they have hitherto favoured are simply factory legislation, savings banks, friendly societies, the legalisation of trades unions, sanitary legislation, State insurance and the like. They are simply the economic wing of the German Imperial State Socialism (see chapter vii.). Nevertheless, they decidedly indicate the changed tone of German Political Economy. Prof. Brentano, who belongs to the extreme right wing of the movement, says that if Adam Smith were alive to-day he would be a Socialist of the Chair.

Dr. Albert Schäffle, of Austria, formerly Minister of Finance in Austria, and one of the most eminent of German Economists, is sometimes called a Socialist because of his *Quintessence of Socialism*, a book which, though somewhat critical, is perhaps the fairest statement of Socialism by one not a Socialist. That he is not one, however, is proved by his later book, *The Impossibilities of Social Democracy*, which he is said to have written because restless under the accusation of being a Socialist. Nevertheless, he long ago said: "The future belongs to the purified Socialism" (*Bau und Leben des Socialen Korpers*, vol. ii., p. 120).

ENGLAND.

The changed tone of English Political Economy we have referred to in the chapter on England (chapter v.). Says Sidney Webb, speaking of England: "One competent Economist, not himself a Socialist, publishes regretfully to the world that all the younger men are now Socialists, with many of the professors. This is not to be wondered at, when we learn that Prof. Marshall (Professor of Political Economy at Cambridge) has at various times declared himself a Socialist; and when we find Prof. Sidgwick (Professor of Moral Philosophy at the same University) contributing an article to the *Contemporary Review*, to prove that the main principles of Socialism are a plain deduction from accepted economic doctrines. When the editor of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* lately required from some eminent Economist an article on Political Economy, fully representing the present position of that science, it was to an avowed Socialist that he addressed himself, and that article took the form of an elaborate survey of the inevitable convergence of all the economic tendencies towards Socialism.

Says Prof. Thomas Kirkup, author of the article "Socialism," in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*: "Socialism may be regarded as a social and economic ideal. But it is an ideal in entire harmony with the requirements of ethical, industrial, and political progress; and it is an ideal supported by the most powerful tendencies of the historic movement of our time. We are moving and ought to move in the direction of Socialism, of a Socialism purified from all that is arbitrary, artificial, and extravagant in its historical development" (*An Inquiry into Socialism*, p. 115).

Says Prof. H. S. Foxwell, of University College, London: "We have been suffering for a century from an acute outbreak of Individualism, unchecked by the old restraints, and invested with almost a religious sanction by a certain soulless school of writers" (p. 249 of essay on "The Claims of Labour").

Says Edward Caird, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow: "The very gigantic scale of modern industry brings with it something socialistic, or it gives rise at least to a necessity for social control. . . . The practical value of the social science of the future will depend, not only on the way in which we break up the complete problem of our existence into manageable parts, but as much and even more upon the way in which we are able to gather the elements together again, and to see how they act and react upon each other in the living movement of the social body" ("Address to the Ethical Society").

THE UNITED STATES.

In America economists are more conservative, and do not like to call themselves Socialists, because the social problem has been there more recently developed, and the average public has not yet wholly learned that Socialism does not of necessity mean dynamite and insurrection. Yet most of the better economists, Prof. Ely especially, advocate to-day the municipalisation of the lighting and heating of cities, and the nationalisation of railroads and the telegraph, and think these measures practical now.

Says Prof. Adams, of Ann Arbor: "The authority of the English (Orthodox or Individualistic) *laissez faire* Economist is shattered beyond recovery".

Says President Francis A. Walker, of the Boston School of Technology: "Communism and Socialism are distinct tendencies. Communism would equitably divide wealth already produced; Socialism would produce more wealth and control its consumption, but not equally divide it. Communism is negative, no man shall have more than another; Socialism is positive, every man shall have enough. . . . Communism is at a standstill, Socialism was never stronger than now" (In a recent essay).

Said James Russell Lowell: "Communism means barbarism; but Socialism means, or wishes to mean, co-operation and community of interests, sympathy, the giving to the hands not so large a share as to the brains, but a larger share than hitherto in the wealth they must combine to produce—means, in short, the practical application of Christianity to life, and has in it the secret of an orderly and benign reconstruction" ("Address on Democracy").

One school of American Economists (Prof. Ely among them) has recently argued that State ownership should be applied to what they term "natural monopolies," railroads, gas companies, etc., but not to ordinary trades or manufactures. Therefore, these professors say they are not Socialists, since they do not go the whole figure. But what are "natural monopolies"? Are not facts proving it perfectly "natural" to monopolise any business as fast as may be? Some industries lend themselves to monopolisation more quickly than others, but it is only a question of time. The same principle runs through all. And when political economists once admit the principle, facts will break down the barriers and distinctions they try to raise, and carry them into avowed Socialism.

THE PRESENT POSITION.

Such are some of the utterances of recognised political economists, which could be multiplied indefinitely from other economists in these countries, as well as from others in Belgium, France, Italy, Switzerland, etc.

The value of these utterances, however, can easily be both over- and under-estimated. They by no means indicate that political economists are on the high road to Socialism. There is even among them at present a reaction against Socialism. Frightened by their own admissions, they are drawing back and trying to show that while there is considerable truth in Socialism, society need not accept the whole Socialist position. Mr. Kidd, for example, says (*Social Evolution*, p. 237): "In the era upon which we are entering, the long up-hill effort to secure equality of political rights will of necessity involve not the restriction of the interference of the State, but the progressive extension of its sphere of action to almost every department of social life. . . . But the continuity of principle may be expected to remain evident under the new appearances. Even in such cases the State will, in reality, assume such functions in order to preserve or secure free competition, rather than to suspend it. Hence the general tendency must be expected to be towards State interference and State control on a greatly extended scale, rather than towards State management." This is probably the opinion of most political economists to-day. But it is wholly a *doctrinaire* position. Mr. Kidd adduces no facts to bear it out. He takes the ground simply as a biologist, that progress demands competition. He forgets wholly that Socialism would not restrain all competition, but simply, according to the evolution of competition (see chapter iii.), replace industrial competition by intellectual competition in service of society. All the facts are, that whatever be the theory, States are steadily assuming, first more control, and secondly more management. States to-day increasingly both control and manage railroads, telegraphs, telephones, expressage, banking, insurance, etc., etc. The theory is spreading fast that municipalities and county councils should do their own work, and the governments of all kinds should at least manufacture for themselves all supplies for armies, printing, etc., etc. No student of *facts* can deny this; while there is scarcely a single instance in modern times of an activity conducted by the State ever reverting to private hands. All the tendency is the other way. Mr. Kidd's position and that of the economists is simply that of *doctrinaires.* Nevertheless, whatever be their reason, it must be admitted that most political economists are not to-day Socialists, and that therefore the quotations above must not be pressed too far. Men occupying chairs in universities endowed by the possessing classes, or dependent in one way or another upon the wealthy, have never been very progressive. Says Mr. Kidd (*Social Evolution*, p. 236): "It has to be confessed that in England during the nineteenth century the educated classes in almost all the great political changes that have been effected have taken the side of the party afterwards admitted to have been in the wrong; they have almost invariably opposed at the time the measures they have subsequently come to defend and to justify. This is to be noticed alike of measures which have extended education, which have emancipated trade, which have extended the franchise. The educated classes have even, it must be confessed, opposed measures which have tended to secure religious freedom and to abolish slavery. The motive force behind the long list of progressive measures, carried during this period, has in scarcely any appreciable measure come from the educated classes; it has come almost exclusively from the middle and lower classes, who have in turn acted, not under the stimulus of intellectual motives, but under the influence of their altruistic feelings."

On the other hand, the value of these admissions by the economists must not be under-estimated. Their main use is to prove that there is no case to be drawn from Political Economy against Socialism. Says Mr. Kidd, speaking of socialistic propositions (*Social Evolution*, p. 208): "A somewhat startling admission has to be made. . . . It is that the arguments by which their advocates lead up to them are unanswered, and even unanswerable, from the point of view from which the greater number of their critics have assailed them." The fact is that Political Economy to-day is utterly adrift and in the dark. There is as yet no well-founded and generally accepted science of society. Said Mr. Leslie Stephen (Presidential Address at the annual meeting of the Social and Political Education League, March, 1892): "There is no science of sociology, properly scientific,—merely a heap of vague empirical observations, too flimsy to be useful in strict logical inference". Says Mr. Kidd, speaking of "probably the largest section" of the community (*Social Evolution*, p. 5): "They feel that some change is inevitable. . . . But at present they simply sit still and wait. They have no indication as to the direction in which the right path lies. They look in vain to science and authority for any hint as to duty. They are without a faith, for there is at the present time no science of human society."

CHAPTER XIV.

SOCIALISM THE ONLY WAY OUT.

It is not claimed by Socialists that Socialism will solve all human ills. They know no quack cure, no panacea, no Morrison's pills for human sorrow. Ignorance, sickness, evil, will continue to exist, they are aware, under Socialism; although, they believe, in a diminished degree. But Socialists do believe that in the *principles* of Socialism lies the one way out of *our present main industrial woes.* Nor is this a narrow position. Socialism is not a single measure like the Single Tax or Co-operation, which are sometimes preached as economic panaceas. Socialism is a collection of principles including a thousand detailed acts. It is the ism that there is no ism. It is the appeal from sectarian reforms to the essential unity of society. Even as a philosophy too, it does not claim to be universal. It recognises truth in Individualism, in Anarchism, in Paternalism, even in Capitalism; it simply holds that Socialism is the one social principle that industry most needs to-day.

Nor in saying this does it deny that Co-operation, Trades Unionism, even Associated Charities, can do, have done, and are doing a vast amount of good. Socialists claim Co-operation, Trades Unionism, and Land Nationalisation as a part of the Socialist advance. They would not only not oppose these, but aid them in every possible way. Without Trades Unionism Socialism would never have been. Co-operation in Belgium has been now for some years the main reliance of Socialism for its means of propaganda. It is one of the good signs in England that the Co-operative and the Socialist movement are somewhat drawing together. So with almost all reforms. However much individual Socialists, in their loyalty to their own ideas, may be betrayed into harsh criticism of reforms conducted upon other lines, Socialism, as a whole, sees in all such reforms allies and not rivals, all pressing forward, consciously or unconsciously, to the realisation of the inherent unity of the social body.

It is only when these reforms themselves become jealous, and instead of taking their respective places claim to be the whole, claim to be all that is necessary, that honest Socialists are compelled to show that they are not enough, and if advanced as substitutes for Socialism are reactionary.

(1) *Mere Trades Unionism will not Answer.*

Says Mr. Sidney Webb, who with his wife (Beatrice Potter) has written a recent and able history of Trades Unionism, and is himself a deep believer in Trades Unions :—

> The belief in universal Trades Unionism as a means of greatly and permanently raising wages all round must be at once dismissed as involving a logical fallacy. Certainly, the workers in some trades have managed to improve their economic position by strict Trades Unions. We are never allowed to forget the splendid incomes earned by these aristocrats of labour, a mere tenth of the whole labour class. But those who merely counsel the rest to go and do likewise forget that the only permanently effective Trades Union victories are won by limitation of the numbers in the particular trade, and the excluded candidates necessarily go to depress the condition of the outsiders. The Trades Unionist can usually only raise himself on the bodies of his less fortunate comrades. If all were equally strong, all would be equally powerless—a point clearly proved by Prof. Cairnes, and obvious to all Trades Unionists themselves (Fabian Tract, No. 15).

Trades Unionists around the world are coming to realise this. Almost everywhere they are coming to see that political action on Socialist lines is an absolute necessity, if working men are ever to materially advance. Almost the only class now who laud Trades Unionism *as a substitute* for Socialism are somewhat sentimental members of the middle class, who first having opposed Trades Unions, now, seeing that something must be done, pat Trades Unions on the shoulder in order to defeat Socialism.

(2) *Mere Co-operation no Solution.*

Says Mr. Webb in the same tract:—

> Co-operation is a more seductive means of escape; and most social reformers cannot, even now, refrain from keeping alive lingering hopes that some solution may here be found. But a whole generation of experiment has done little more than show the futility of expecting real help from this quarter. Less than one four-hundredth part of the industry of the country is yet carried on by Co-operation. The whole range of industrial development in the larger industries seems against it; and no ground for hope in Co-operation as a complete answer to the social problem can be gained from economic science. It fails to deal even with the real elements of the case. It may claim to obviate competition; but, as Mill himself quotes, "the deepest root of the evils and iniquities which fill the industrial world is *not* competition, but the subjection of labour to capital, and the enormous share which the possessors of the instruments of production are able to take from the produce". Co-operation can make no real defence against the continuance of the exaction of this "enormous share"—rent and interest—the continued individual enjoyment of which it, indeed, actually presupposes. It affords a valuable moral training, a profitable savings bank for investments, and a temporary means of interesting the worker in the industrial affairs of his country. But ordinary joint stock investment is now rapidly outgrowing it, and is already a hundred and sixty times as great as Co-operation. Now even the most enthusiastic believer in the virtues of association will hardly expect salvation merely from a *régime* of Joint Stock Companies ; and this, and not Co-operation, is clearly the line in which our industrial development is rapidly travelling, so far as all large enterprises are concerned. The final goal of many industries is, moreover, obviously not the Co-operative Society, but the municipality. Nearly twice as much capital is already invested by town councils in a single industry (gas supply) as the whole twelve millions of the accumulations of the 1500 co-operative societies. A larger extension of "municipal industry" is made every year than the progress, great as it is, of the Co-operative industry. Already where there is most Co-operation, there is also most municipalisation. Nevertheless, it may be some time before the more enthusiastic co-operators realise the industrial tendency, or even become aware that modern economic science turns regretfully against them; yet such eminent authorities as Cliffe Leslie, Professor Walker, Mr. Leonard Courtney, and Dr. J. K. Ingram, concur in dismissing the idea of universal Co-operation as chimerical.

Co-operation too, from the workman's standpoint, is often even dangerous. Business to-day in all the great centres, and in all the great industries, demands as an absolute prerequisite to success, vast capital. Against great corporations or individual employers owning such vast capital, small Co-operative efforts cannot to-day possibly compete. The start of the great English Co-operative movement was made when concentration of capital was by no means so great as to-day. In very many industries, for working men to put their hard-earned savings into Co-operative experiments is to throw them away, as thousands and thousands of workmen have found to their cost. Often too, these Co-operative stores, though begun with the highest motives, are, before they know it, driven by the competition of conscienceless corporations or individual dealers to practices sometimes worse than those of capitalists. Many a Co-operative tailor's store, begun by philanthropists, has become, before it knew it, a sweating den. Under very exceptional circumstances, in small towns, in trades where competition is not intense, Co-operation may perhaps be established to-day, or in countries where Co-operation has gotten a hold, it may doubtless even thrive, but even thus it is very questionable whether the same amount of effort, directed on Socialist lines, would not produce vastly more results. Certain it is that, particularly for the most needy classes, Co-operation can never make Socialism unnecessary. Combination, Socialistic or Capitalistic, has the future.

(3) *Profit Sharing no Help.*

The form of Co-operation, which is not Co-operation but Profit Sharing, instituted by large firms, may financially succeed to-day, and be productive of some temporary good in interesting the workmen in their work. But too often it is merely reactionary, a mere sop to keep workmen content under Capitalism. It is therefore not spreading to-day. The problem is gradually to do away with Capitalism, and in this direction Profit Sharing confessedly does not move. Profit Sharing does not at all meet the problem of competition between *employers*, and therefore is useless as a solvent or step towards solving labour problems. Many firms are troubled to-day, not how to divide profits, but how to make profits. For that problem, Combination, either Socialistic or Monopolistic, is the only cure. Democrats will prefer Socialism.

(4) *Charity no Solution.*

Says Mr. Webb (*ibid.*) :—

> It must clearly be recognised that no mere charitable palliation of existing individualism can achieve this end. Against this complacent delusion of the philanthropist, Political Economy emphatically protests. So long as the instruments of production are in unrestrained private ownership, so long must the tribute of the workers to the drones continue: so long will the toilers' reward inevitably be reduced by their exactions. No tinkering with the Land Laws can abolish or even diminish Economic Rent.

Many and many a capitalist employer really desires to help his employees, really tries to carry on a clean business, tries to do good, tries to pay fair wages; but he cannot under the present system. While industrial competition, each for himself, lasts, no manufacturer, no employer can pay the wages he would like. Under the law of competition, manufacturers *must* sell cheaply. If they do not sell cheaply, orders will go to other factories very quickly. But in order to sell cheaply factories must pay the lowest wages they can get the work done for. To an extent Edward Atkinson is right, that high wages are cheap wages, and that it pays in the long run to employ high priced labour. But this has limits. The factory manager must get the lowest priced labour *that will produce a given quantity and quality of goods.* Now more and more machinery is enabling unskilled labour—girl labour, child labour—to do the work of men. Machines and "hands" are replacing the work of man. Man is pitted against steam, against electricity. Machines are replacing hand work in all the trades from fifty to two hundred per cent. Consequently, unskilled labour replaces skilled abour, women replace men, children women, and machines children. This is not theory, but fact; and the employer cannot help himself. The mere individual cannot in business apply the golden rule. "I detest the methods of my business," said an employer, "but as long as capitalism lasts I am helpless." Business should start not from the individual but from society.

Charity may temporarily relieve a few, but it cannot meet our industrial problem. What men need is not associated charity, but a new system of associated justice.

(5) *Land Nationalisation or Taxation not Enough.*

One earnest school of reformers, fearing lest Socialism develop into an unwieldy and burdensome regimentation, urges that it will be a sufficient remedy for our main present ills if we nationalise the land alone, or collect value of the land in a tax which shall absorb economic rent. They urge that the trouble to-day is not that we have competition, but that we have not enough competition. They say that if no man was allowed to monopolise the natural resources of the earth, all men would have equal opportunity, and it would be impossible for one man to enslave another. They urge that there is a fundamental economic difference between private property in land and private property in other forms of capital. Other forms of capital, they say, are the product of human labour, and can therefore justly be allowed to belong to the men who have produced them; but land, they say, no man produced. The apparent justice of this position, and its deep and far-spreading reach, make many believe that here is a reform which, if once taken, would make Socialism unnecessary. It is a reform that appeals especially strongly to two classes of men: first, the old-fashioned individualist democrats who fear government, and think the best government is that which governs least; and secondly, to a certain class of religious minds who think there is a divinely appointed distinction between land, the work of God, and capital, the work of man. But here again Socialists have distinctly to shake their head. It is perfectly true that land should be nationalised; all Socialists believe in that, and not a few Socialists believe that the best way for society to resume its ownership of the soil is by a gradual taxation of land values, till finally the full annual value be taken. Against this Socialism has little, if anything, to say; but it does distinctly say that this is not enough. The dictum of science is that men in fact are not born equal. Therefore, even if all present inequalities of wealth were done away (an impossible supposition), some men would make better use of the soil, whose annual value they paid to society, and accumulate wealth. Shrewd men, dishonest men, selfish men, smart men, would soon have their weaker or their more scrupulous brethren at an advantage. They would multiply capital, and be able to produce at rates that smaller capitalists could not compete with. Rent of houses and machinery, interest on money, would soon curse society almost as much as to-day. Such is, Socialists claim, the simple teaching of common sense. Nor can the principle that capital should be private property, because it is the work of man, be allowed in equity, since it is practically impossible to say what man produced any given portion of capital. All successful production to-day, mental and manual alike, is the result of social processes so intricate that it is impossible to measure the share in the production taken by any one man. Says Edward Bellamy: "Nine hundred and ninety-nine parts out of the thousand of every man's produce are the result of his social inheritance and environment" (*Contemporary Review*, July, 1890). Nor can one appeal to divine law. If the production of a continent be a divine process, so is the production of a steamship. To find God in the soil and not in the human brain, is a conception that religion cannot allow. God is the God of the living, and not of the dead. All life is divine. If the earth is the Lord's, so also is the fulness thereof. Nor can justice endorse the mere socialisation of the earth. Why should one man who has invested his money in land have its value taken from him, and not the man who has invested his money in a factory? Nationalisation of land is a project that has rightly won the assent of many of the noblest minds, and a growing portion of the community generally; but the large majority of these, like the scientist, Mr. Wallace, have gone on from this position to see that justice and practical necessity, expediency and the divine law, all call for the similar socialisation of capital of every kind.

(6) *In Anarchism there lies no Hope.*

Few minds to-day see hope in Anarchism. Anarchists, and especially Anarchist Communists, are usually men of more earnestness and devotion than hard-headedness. Many of them are Socialists driven to desperation. Several of the leading Anarchist Communists (*e.g.*, Bakunin and Kropotkine) are Russians with experience of Russian tyranny. Anarchism is the not unnatural result of despotism, a fact which those who would in these days try to repress Anarchism by more despotism would do well to ponder. Just democratic government and Socialism are the best cure for Anarchism. Where there is the most of this, where Socialism is most developed, there is the least Anarchism. It is only necessary in a few words to show the futility of Anarchism.

There are, as we have seen (chapter ii.), two forms of Anarchism. Philosophical Anarchists are extreme individualists, who, logically following out the philosophy of individual sovereignty, would let every individual do anything that he would and could. They would do away with all rule of man by man. They would only prevent attacks upon each other by having the majority, whom they believe to be naturally peaceful, voluntarily combine to defend their own possessions, or hire men to do so. "Liberty," they say, "is the mother of order." But land is of unequal value. One man would have land in a city, another in a desert; one man fertile land, another barren. The owners of the best land, being at an immense advantage, could hire other people to work for them at prices only slightly above what the men hired could get by tilling poor land yet unappropriated, and very much less than the worth of their labour to the fortunate occupiers of the good land. With the profit from this labour the rich could buy improved machinery, and, in fact, repeat all the evils of society to-day. With money the rich could hire men to fight for them. In fact, we should have modern society over again, only without any vestige of conscience, for Anarchism confessedly recognises might as the only right. Philosophical

Anarchism is a mere groundless theory, based on the position for which there is not the slightest foundation—in fact, that men are naturally equal, and one place on the surface of the globe is as good as another. In actual life it would never work, and to the toiler presents no hope.

Anarchist Communism is theoretically wiser and practically more foolish. It would not have private property in either land or capital. It would institute Communism. Now, this Socialists would do (with land and capital); only Anarchists would do it by abolishing government, and Socialists by capturing governments through legal methods, and using them to institute such Communism.

Which is the more hopeful way? The Anarchist Communist creates chaos, bloodshed, and confusion in hope of establishing brotherhood. But the sword settles nothing. Hate produces hate. Dynamite produces only blind resistance. It destroys, but constructs nothing. It is contrary to all the laws of evolution. It may be easy to argue that the assassination of one king is justified if it will save the lives of a thousand. To kill ten men if it will save ten thousand is perhaps right; but here is just the point, will it save ten thousand? Are subjects made free by assassinating their king? Are they subjects of the king or of the kingly *idea?* To obtain real freedom you must kill not the king but the idea. Socialists have learned that. Six years ago Mr. G. Bernard Shaw wrote: "The young Socialist is apt to be catastrophic in his views—to plan the revolutionary programme as an affair of twenty-four lively hours, with Individualism in full swing on Monday morning, a tidal wave of the insurgent proletariat on Monday afternoon, and Socialism in complete working order on Tuesday. A man who believes that such a happy despatch is possible will naturally think it absurd and even inhuman to stick at bloodshed in bringing it about. He can prove that the continuance of the present system for a year costs more suffering than could be crammed into any Monday afternoon, however sanguinary. This is the phase of conviction in which are delivered those Socialist speeches which make what the newspapers call 'good copy,' and which are the only ones they as yet report."

To-day even the youngest Socialist has got beyond that. By slow, persistent, political methods, he to-day makes steady advance, and what he once gains he never loses. Says Mr. Shaw, "demolishing a Bastille with seven prisoners in it is one thing: Demolishing one with fourteen million prisoners is quite another". In the mere creation of chaos there is no hope.

CHAPTER XV.

OBJECTIONS TO SOCIALISM.

Objection A.—That Socialism would never work because it forgets that men are too selfish and ignorant to be able to enter into and carry on the vast co-operative state that it would require.

This is to many the supreme objection against Socialism. Knowing the ability it takes to organise and carry on even an ordinary business, their experience with trades unions and other organisations of the so-called working classes has not convinced them that the masses are able to conduct the enormous interests that Socialism would place in their hands; while their knowledge of government, under the corrupting power of appointments, does not incline them to turn over to government all the offices that would have to be filled under a system of nationalised railroads, to speak of nothing more.

But let us look at facts. This is all that Socialists ask. Has not co-operation succeeded as a matter of fact almost marvellously? Have not English, American, German, and French working men proved themselves capable of co-operation, even on a very large scale? Do we know that there were in Great Britain and Ireland, a year ago, no less than 1589 co-operative societies, making returns, with 1,207,511 members, owning capital amounting to £17,241,099, with sales of £48,028,171? Does not this, at least, show what can be done? Do we realise that there are in Germany 4401 co-operative banks, and 4017 other co-operative societies? Are we aware that Prof. Ely says that "the average annual co-operative transactions of the United States may be safely estimated at millions of dollars"? Does this look as if the public was not yet fitted to co-operate?

Nor against the great success of co-operation must one count the frequent admitted failures. Co-operative experiments have to battle against the competition of enormous combinations of wealthy private firms, able to carry on business for a year at a loss, in order to run out the co-operative venture. Under the circumstances, the wonder is not that co-operation sometimes fails, but that it ever succeeds. Its success only shows what the masses can do against great odds, odds indeed so great that we do not believe the future can be fought out on private lines. In a co-operative commonwealth where the community carried on all industry, it would have no such organised foe to meet. If working men can succeed at all now, what could they not do then? And it must not be supposed that industry would be taken over by the States *en bloc.* Socialists are evolutionists. Little by little would they have business socialised. Industry is to-day being largely concentrated in a few hands. Its practical details are not managed by owners, but by salaried overseers and managers. In being socialised an industry could still be managed in exactly the same way, and often, perhaps usually, by the same men, only by these men working for the public and not for a few stockholders. There would be no upheaval, and small change. The very process actually happens to-day whenever a railroad goes into the hands of a receiver. What break is there in the working of the road? If conceived as a gradual evolution and not a cataclysm, there is no difficulty on the ground of efficiency in the programme of Socialism, for "what man hath done man can do".

Now, as to the corruption of government. We are not to think, in the first place, of a vast centralised machine. We are to remember that Socialism is essentially democratic, with great emphasis on *local self-government.* Each sub-department would be self-controlling, electing its own head, these heads electing their leaders, and so on to the top, or the system of the German municipality would be followed (see chapter vii.). There would be less of the central appointing power than there is to-day. The safety of the town meeting system in the United States is that every man knows personally the man he votes for, and so the right men are elected, which principle would be carried out under Socialism, only still further. But let us appeal to facts. What are the causes of the corruption of government, as in the United States? First, the fact that for generations Americans have despised government, and let it play a small and a low part in their life. This has had its natural result. Smart, pushing men have been able to make more money elsewhere; therefore they have not taken office; good men have, as a rule, left politics alone. Is it any wonder that such politics have become corrupt? Men have left government to the saloon keeper, and now blame government because they have pot-house politics. This is the first reason. The second reason is that business having been amassed in a few hands, and these few having found that special legislation can be had by directly or indirectly bribing the low politicians, the average corporation to-day has become politically a corrupting power. We do not need to prove these points. They are admitted by every thinker. It is to this corruptive power of amassed wealth, playing upon the venality, and sometimes the necessities of those who have made politics a profession, that is due the scandalous corruption of especially municipal governments. Socialism would simply remove both causes, and the only way out is through Socialism. As long as there are masses of poor people on the one side, and a few corporations enormously wealthy on the other, there will be corruption, and no amount of indignant "citizens' movements" can permanently prevent it. As long as corporations pay managers and attorneys several times the salaries that the State pays, the smartest men will be in the service of the corporations, inside or outside of government. The way to pure government is not first to purify the State and then increase its activities. This is chimerical. But first to increase its activities, to make it important, to enable it to pay large salaries and to carry out large ideas, and then it will become pure; men will be attracted to it who cannot be bought. Just so long as we despise the State will it be despicable; when we begin to magnify it and exalt it over the corporations, will it begin to be pure and magnificent. We base this statement not upon theory but upon facts.

Birmingham was once the most corrupt municipality in England. Squalor and over-crowding were universal. The death rate was enormous. Vice and crime flourished. Saloon keepers were the only contented people. A tavern coterie ruled the city. But in 1871 Mr. Chamberlain came forward with a programme of municipal activity. He was elected; a loan of £1,600,000 was obtained, and to-day Birmingham is perhaps what it was called by Julian Ralph in *Harper's Magazine*, "the best governed city in the world," "a business city, run by business men on business principles". "It builds," he tells us, "its own street railroads, makes and sells its own gas, collects and sells its water supply, raises and sells a great part of the food of its inhabitants, provides them with a free museum, art gallery, and art school, gives them swimming and Turkish baths at less than cost, and interests a larger portion of its people in responsibility for and management of its affairs than any city in the United Kingdom, if not in the world." This is Socialism; as Mr. Ralph says in his closing sentence, "a real Socialism, self-governed and self-imposed". The experience of Glasgow is largely the same. It was recently the most crowded city in Great Britain, excepting Liverpool, and full of every evil. It has now municipal water supply, gas supply, park system, a consolidated market system, a horse-car system leased to a private corporation, but only on terms most favourable to the city, bringing into the city a very large revenue. It spends more money for lighting tenement courts than some cities spend on streets. It has spent £1,400,000 to pull down and rebuild its worst tenements, with the result that mortality has been decreased from 54 per thousand to 29 per thousand.

Is Socialism not practical? Or take Berlin. Prof. Ely calls *it* the best governed city in the world. It has municipal railways, water works, gas works, a horse-car system leased to a private company which paves the streets it uses, pays the city something like £50,000 a year, and agrees to turn over the whole system, with all its equipments, to the city in 1911. Compare this with the scandalous terms on which individualistic American City Councillors rob the people to turn over franchises to fraudulent corporations. The Berlin municipal gas works alone yielded the city, at last accounts, some eighteen per cent. of its entire annual outlay. The same principle is illustrated in the little community of Klingenberg-on-the-Main in Germany. In the neighbourhood of this town are valuable pits of fireproof clay, which the authorities in days gone by were far-sighted enough to retain as public property, instead of allowing them to be owned by individuals. They are worked by the municipality for the public benefit. The result is that Klingenberg is one of the happiest places in Europe. Not only do the profits on the clay suffice to cover all local and imperial taxation, but there is a considerable surplus, the bulk of which is divided among the inhabitants. In addition, a present of fifteen marks is made this year to every young man who is beginning his military service. There is no reason why this principle cannot work anywhere. The mayor of Marquette, Mich., recently declared that the profits from its municipal electric plant, by selling power to the corporations, nearly paid, and if continued, would wholly pay, all expenses of the city without any tax whatsoever. And yet people call Socialism unpractical. They only think so because our corporations, directly or indirectly, through their advertisements, pay our city press to dub Socialism Utopian. Under Socialism there need be no taxation, though we should prefer to tax land values and spend the money in State employment of the unemployed. It is to simple facts, not to theories, that Socialists point.

It is, of course, not claimed that Socialism would be absolutely pure. It is only claimed that there would be far less corruption than to-day. Even now, though politics are corrupt, they are often far less corrupt than private corporations. If the United States Post Office Department is not pure, it is at least vastly more pure than the private Western Union Telegraph Company.

Objection B.—That if Socialism were practical it would be utterly undesirable, since it would set up a vast mechanism and tyranny, too often of the commonplace, and so repress freedom, and *that Individualism, which, with whatever evil it may entail, at least develops character, self-reliance, self-development, moral results that vastly over-balance any possible material good results of Socialism.*

This is, indeed, of infinite importance; and if the point is well taken, let Socialism indeed perish; no amount of material comfort can at all atone for lack of individual character. But is the point well taken?

In the first place, one must not judge of Socialism by the Utopias that have been painted of it. The use of Utopias is not to portray the working of Socialism, but to stimulate the thought of those *who lack imagination.* No one can portray Socialism, any more than Radicalism, because Socialism is a principle, not a scheme. It is a mode of freedom, not a mould into which society can be run.

Again, it must be remembered that we are not speaking of paternal, imperial Socialism; true Socialists are the opposite of paternalists. The Socialists of Germany, for example, recently cast one million five hundred thousand votes against the so-called paternal Socialism of the Emperor. It is the wealthy Carnegies who would manage all business, and give of their fortunes for the good of working men, who are the real paternalists of the day. We are defending democratic Socialism, where the people are the government, and work and manage for themselves. That, we say, would develop character. Nay, it would be the very "open sesame" of character. Each man would then have to work. No drones here; no beggars living on the rich; no wealthy parasites fattening on the poor. If any man refused to work he would be left to starve, yet with no one to blame but himself, *for every man would then have an opportunity to work.* By simply doing a few hours of honest work each day for a few years of his life (each man choosing his own kind of work, the more disagreeable kinds of work being favoured by less hours being demanded in them, so that men would be found to choose even them), every man would be sure of an honest competence. Does any man assert that this would not produce better and more independent character than we have to-day? No sycophancy of employee to employer; no dependence of professional men upon patrons; no servility of men of genius to men of money. There would still be competition, but for honour, not for money. Men would battle to see who should best serve the community, and so be honoured by their fellow-men; they would not be forced to battle, as men are forced to battle to-day, however much they hate it, to undercut their rivals, or enter into "combines" against the public. Competition for honour would alone be appealed to, as that alone would mean success. Mrs. Annie Besant well says: "It is instructive to notice that these very forces may already be seen at work in every case in which subsistence is secured, and honour alone supplies the stimulus to action. The soldier's subsistence is certain, and does not depend on his exertions. At once he becomes susceptible to appeals to his patriotism, to his *esprit de corps*, to the honour of his flag; he will dare anything for glory, and value a bit of bronze, which is the 'reward of valour,' far more than a hundred times its weight in gold. Yet many of the private soldiers come from the worst of the population." (Let those especially notice this last point who fancy that we must wait till men are angels before Socialism be practical.)

She continues: "Or take the eagerness, self-denial, and strenuous effort thrown by young men into their mere games! The desire to be captain of the Oxford eleven, stroke of the Cambridge boat, victor in the foot-race or the leaping—in a word, the desire to excel—is strong enough to impel to exertions which often ruin physical health. Everywhere we see the multiform desires of humanity assert themselves when once livelihood is secured."

With short hours for work and no dread for the future as long as one is willing to work, there would be time for reading, time for art, time for God. There would be a Revival of Learning, a Renaissance of Art, a Reformation in Religion.

Surely those who fear that Socialism would check individuality do not realise how little true individuality we have to-day. On questions of personal liberty Mill surely may be allowed some weight, and Mill declares that "the restraints of Communism [he means what we mean by Socialism] would be freedom, in comparison with the present condition of the majority of the human race". Ninety-nine one-hundredths of mankind, even in civilised countries to-day, are fettered by their dependence upon money. Simply to live, painters paint pot-boilers, dramatists write dramas to fill the house, undertakers smirk and bow and scrape, reporters report "to suit," clergymen preach sermons that will "draw". Socialism, in a word, would mean independence compared with the present.

Socialism, again, would largely solve the woman question, by making woman financially independent of man, without ignoring the natural differences that must ever exist between man and woman. It would re-discover married love in many a home, by taking the money question out of marriage.

As for Mr. Spencer's argument that Socialism would be slavery because governments have always been tyrannical, and because the tyranny of the majority, being the tyranny of the average multitude, would be the worst kind of tyranny, it is at once to be granted that governments have been tyrannical. But this is only to assert that man is a developing being, and is not yet perfect. Lack of government, anarchy, individual whim law, have been a hundred times more tyrannical. It is easy, as Mr. Spencer does, to catalogue "the sins of legislators," easier than to catalogue the sins of individuals, because this would be a much longer list. No; government with all its faults in the past, and we grant them all, has been an immeasurable blessing to mankind, and will be in the future. By doing away with government, you would have licence, but you would not have liberty. Let us look again at facts. Ancient Athens, as far as its *free* population went, was largely a Socialist city. The government was democratic, and it controlled all life. It ruled business, conducted commerce, founded colonies; built baths, markets, temples, gymnasia, theatres; it conducted worship, developed art, worked mines, lands, factories; it was not so much supported by taxes from citizens as it supported its citizens out of the results of its wars or its State revenues. People lived and worked for the State far more than for the individual. This, according to all authorities, was the distinguishing feature of Greek economic thought; and this is Socialism. Now, did it crush individuality? Facts are teachers. Has the world ever seen such a galaxy of great individualities as were produced by this same Socialistic city? Does any one seriously suppose that Socrates and Plato and Aristotle and Demosthenes would have ever been, had they spent their lives struggling to buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market? Does a modern board of trade turn out Plutarch's men? Dare anybody look history in the face and assert that economic individualism, a state of society based on everybody's pushing for number one, has turned out any individualities the world cares to remember? It undoubtedly does develop a Jay Gould, a Baron Rothschild; but are these flowers of civilisation of which we have any reason to be proud? Says Andrew Carnegie: "The greatest discovery of my life is that the men who do the work never get rich".

Prof. Huxley has well ridiculed Mr. Spencer's conception of society, where every man is for himself, and no man has much to do with his neighbours, except to prevent their interference with himself. He says: "Suppose that, in accordance with his view, each muscle were to maintain that the nervous system had no right to interfere with its contraction, except to prevent it from hindering the contraction of another muscle; or each gland that it had a right to secrete, so long as its secretion interfered with no other; suppose every separate cell left free to follow its own 'interests,' and *laissez faire*, Lord of all, what would become of the body physiological?" Socialists do well to refer to the physical world. What is Socialism but the development of a new social organism, where each part works for all, and all work for each? It is in the direct line of evolution.

Objection C.—The biological one that Socialism would lead to over-population, or if population were restricted, in any way, to race deterioration, which (biologists assert) must be the result of *the limitation of the opportunity of the fittest to crush out the unfit.*

The dangers of over-population need not trouble many. No one can travel through even the most crowded countries in the world, without seeing that there is room enough for an increase of population of untold millions, if men were not driven by industrial competition to scramble for a livelihood in great cities. While as for the food, the possible food production of the great torrid zones of the earth have not begun to be scientifically developed, and scarcely touched. Mr. Edward Atkinson has shown that in the United States alone, the food produce could be doubled "by merely bringing our product up to our average standard of reasonably good agriculture". While, even as it is, one-fifth of the arable land of that country has not yet been touched. Again, it is absolutely proven that, whatever be the reason, reproductivity does not keep pace with advancing civilisation and education. Over-population is simply a myth to scare the unthinking with. God's laws may be trusted to care for all God's children, provided only that we keep God's laws. Take money out of marriage; let it be no more what competition of money often makes it to-day, mere legalised prostitution, and our children shall be as arrows in the hands of the mighty, and blessed will be the man that has his quiver full of them. The real problem of life is not how to provide for the children that shall be born, but how to see to it that children be born right, and to this end improved social conditions will contribute largely. Under Socialism we shall have none "born tired" and few born diseased. As for the threatened deterioration of the race through lack of competition, Socialism, in the first place, does not propose to abolish competition, only to lift it to a higher plane and make it not industrial (see chapter iii.), and secondly, it is not proven that competition is the *only* means to progress. Mr. Kidd's *Social Evolution*, in which he, without any proof, declares that the lack of competition must produce deterioration, is full of facts showing how *altruism* has produced progress; and if healthy environment, fresh air and good food tend to make healthy bodies, as we think no scientist will deny, it follows at once that altruism, and any reform which improves the condition of the poor, must improve the race. Said F. D. Maurice: " Competition is put forth as the law of the universe. This is a lie. The time is come to declare it is a lie by word and deed."

Objection D.—That, even if good in theory, Socialism is too Utopian, too sentimental, too unpractical to be worth consideration now, while it is even harmful in detracting attention from what can be done to-day.

This, to any informed person, is almost a ludicrous objection, since all informed people are agreed that, whether we like it or not, Socialism is upon us and coming very rapidly. Herbert Spencer thinks Socialism slavery, but he calls it the Coming Slavery. Sir William Harcourt said in Parliament several years ago: " We are all Socialists now ". President Francis A. Walker of Boston has recently asserted that " Socialism was never stronger than now ". In Germany there are 1,800,000 Socialist *voters*, besides their families and friends, and not counting the Academic and Christian Socialists. In France the Socialist vote is 600,000, and has a strong representation in the Legislature. In Italy there are 180,000 active members of Socialist societies. In little Switzerland there were recently 52,000 signatures to a Socialist petition, and 80,000 voters for it. In Belgium the Socialists are, perhaps, better organised than anywhere else in the world, recently carrying out a universal strike, which in one week compelled the Government to adopt a wholly new and almost revolutionary Constitution. If in England Socialists have not developed a strong separate party, it is only because it was claimed that *all* English parties were honeycombed with Socialism.

It must be remembered that Socialism depending on political majorities can actually carry out no really Socialistic programme till it has that majority; but it may be, even *while nothing is being done*, advancing toward that majority with great rapidity. This is the fact to-day in more countries than one. (See the chapters on the Socialist movement in England, Germany, France, and Belgium.)

The truth is, that it is not *doctrinaire* principles but stubborn facts that are hurrying the world towards Socialism. Combinations have set in in gigantic power in every direction. Unless we are to have the combination of the few, which is despotism, we must have the combination of the many, which is Socialism; and the working man is seeing this at last. Socialism is on the threshold of the twentieth century.

APPENDIX A.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON SOCIALIST WRITERS AND LEADERS OF ALL COUNTRIES; TOGETHER WITH THOSE OF SOME NOT SOCIALISTS BUT CONNECTED WITH THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT.

ADDERLEY, HON. AND REV. JAMES.

Studied at Oxford; became first head of Oxford House (East London); aided the dockers in the Dock Strike, raising for them £800; he has now founded a Church Brotherhood, working in Plaistow. He is author of *Stephen Remarx*, a Christian Socialist story, and editor of *Good Will*, a monthly paper adapted for parish use, on Christian Social themes. It has a circulation of 24,000.

ADLER, DR. VIKTOR, b. 1852.

One of the most prominent Socialist leaders in Austria, and editor of the *Arbeiter Zeitung*, the weekly organ of the Austrian Social Democratic Party. Educated as a physician, he has given this up to devote himself to the Socialist propaganda. Although previously somewhat interested, his active efforts for the party commenced in 1886, when he started a weekly, the *Gleichheit*, and was mainly instrumental in bringing the Radical and Moderate wings of the party together, and so laying the foundation for the recent successes of the Austrian movement. In 1889 the editors of the *Gleichheit* were proceeded against on the charge of Anarchism; but to-day the *Arbeiter Zeitung* more than takes its place. He has written numerous important books or tracts; among others, *Die Arbeiterkammern und die Arbeiter* (1886); *Das allgemeine, gleiche und direkte Wahlrecht und das Wahlunrecht in Oesterreich* (1893); *Schwurgerichtsverhandlung gegen, wegen Religionstörung, Aufwiegelung, vor dem Reichenberger Schwurgericht.*

ANSEELE, EDUARD, b. 1856.

Son of a shoemaker in Ghent; clerk in a notary's office, he became a painter in order to work for Socialism, and later founded the papers *Volkswil* and *Vooruit.* His great work, however, was the foundation of the *Vooruit*, the Socialist Co-operative Bakery and Socialist Club of Ghent, and precursor of the very important Socialist co-operative movement in Belgium. He is author of a Flemish Socialistic novel, for which he suffered six months' imprisonment.

ARISTOTLE, b. 384 B.C.

Born at Stagira. Pupil of Plato. After Plato's death he was invited to Macedonia by Philip, 342 B.C., and became the teacher of Alexander. After Alexander started on his Asiatic expedition Aristotle returned to Athens, 334 B.C., and founded the *Lyceum* or "Peripatetic School". He died at Chalcis. His main works are the *Nikomachean Ethics*, *Organon*, *Logic*, *Rhetoric*, *Poetics*, *Physics*, and *Politics ;* the first and last named works contain his main social teachings. His knowledge of facts for his times was encyclopedic. Prof. Ingram (*Hist. of Polit. Econ.*, p. 16) says of Aristotle : "Aristotle, like all the Greek thinkers, recognises but one doctrine of the State, under which ethics, politics proper, and economics take their place as departments, bearing to each other a very close relation, and having indeed their lines of demarcation from each other not very distinctly marked. When wealth comes under consideration, it is studied not as an end in itself, but with a view to the higher elements and ultimate aims of the collective life. The origin of society he traces, not to economic necessities, but to natural social impulses in the human constitution. The nature of social union, when thus established, being determined by the partly spontaneous, partly systematic combination of diverse activities, he respects the independence of the latter whilst seeking to effect their convergence. He therefore opposes himself to the suppression of personal freedom and initiative, and the excessive subordination of the individual to the State, and rejects the community of property and wives proposed by Plato for his governing class. The principle of private property he regards as deeply rooted in man, and the evils which are alleged to result from the corresponding social ordinance he thinks ought really to be attributed either to the imperfections of our nature or to the vices of other public institutions. Community of goods must, in his view, tend to neglect of the common interest and to the disturbance of social harmony." In his *Politics* (bk. i., 2, §§ 12-14) Aristotle says: "The State is, by nature, clearly prior to the individual and to the family, since the whole is of necessity prior to the part. . . . The proof that the State is a creation of nature, and prior to the individual, is that the individual, when isolated, is not self-sufficing; and, therefore, he is like a part in relation to the whole. But he who is unable to live in society, or who has no need because he is sufficient for himself, must be either a beast or a god."

AVELING, EDWARD B., b. 1852.

Doctor of Natural Science, residing in London. With S. Moore he translated Marx's *Das Kapital* into English, and has also issued an abridgment called *The Student's Marx*. He has been active in the new Trades Unionism of England, especially in connection with the Gasworkers and General Labourers' Union. His wife, Eleanor, was the youngest daughter of Karl Marx.

BAADER, FRANZ XAVIER, 1765-1851.

Born in Munich. Friend of Humboldt. In 1841 Professor at Munich; deposed from his chair, 1848, on account of utterances against Roman absolutism. A Christian Socialist, he advocated a "theocracy" or Christian State, as opposed to a democracy of revolution. Co-operate action and association he considered essential. He resisted, however, all attacks on private property. The *Encyc. Brit.* calls him "without doubt the greatest speculative theologian of modern Catholicism". He largely influenced Bishop Ketteler, *q. v.* Works, 16 vols., with a biography by Hoffman, 1850-1860.

BABŒUF, FRANÇOIS NOEL, 1764-1797.

Born at Saint Quentin. Advocate of violent revolution. He edited the *Tribun du Peuple*, calling himself CAIUS GRACCHUS. After the fall of Robespierre he gathered round him a group of people, aiming at absolute equality. They met at the Pantheon till dispersed by Napoleon. They planned a general uprising, but were discovered, and Babœuf and Darthé condemned to die. They stabbed themselves before the tribunal, but did not die, and were executed on the guillotine, 27th May, 1797. Babœuf's equality is based largely on Morelly's *Code de la Nature*. (See Morelly.) Government was to force rigid equality, even to similarity of food and dress. Victor Advielle and Filippo Buonarrotti have each written histories of Babœuf and *Babœuvisme.*

BACON, FRANCIS, 1561-1626.

Born in London, 1595. Member of Parliament, 1607. Solicitor-General, 1619. Lord Chancellor and Baron of Verulam, 1621. Condemned to imprisonment in the Tower for corruption ; died at Highgate. Best known for his inductive philosophy, *Novum Organum*, 1620, and *De dignitate et augmentis scientiarum*, 1605. His *New Atlantis*, his social Utopia, was written 1614-1617, and appeared in 1627, one year after his death.

BAKUNIN, MICHAEL, 1814-1876.

Born in Torschok. Educated in St. Petersburg. Cavalry officer in Poland. In 1838 he left the service to study philosophy in Moscow with Herzen, the revolutionist, and others. In 1841 he went to Berlin and studied Hegelianism, Schopenhauer, and Stirner. In 1847 he met Proudhon at Paris. In 1848 he attended the Pan Slavist Congress at Prague. In 1849 he took part in the Dresden insurrection, and was captured and condemned to death ; but was handed over to the Russians, and imprisoned at St. Petersburg, and later transported to Siberia. In 1850 he escaped, through Japan, America, England, to Switzerland. Here he established a centre of revolution, writing in the *Kolokol* (Bell), established by Herzen at London. In 1863 he aided the Polish insurrection. In 1865 he joined the International; and opposing Marx, became the leader of the left wing, preaching revolution in Italy and elsewhere. At the Congress at Basle in 1869 he carried the majority with him, and at a divisional Swiss Congress at Chaux de Fonds, in 1870, forced the followers of Marx to withdraw, and then founded the Federation of the Jura. In 1871 he took part in the uprising of the Commune at Lyons. He gradually became wilder and wilder, an "apostle of destruction," preaching Anarchism and not Socialism. In 1872, Marx succeeded in calling the International Congress at the Hague, where Bakunin could not come, since he would have been arrested in passing through Germany or France. The followers of Bakunin, "Anarchist Communists," as they later called themselves, were thus defeated at the Hague. The Socialists under Marx completely separated themselves from Bakunin and his Anarchism, and transferred the General Council to New York city. Bakunin, however, in the Federation of the Jura, called together a rival Autonomist Congress of the International, and declared against all political action, and for terrorism "and the propaganda by deed". Bakunin died in Berne, 1st July, 1876. He is said, by Reclus, to have been a man of great thought, strength of will, and untiring energy. By Felix Dubois he is described as a man of no original thought, hungry only for notoriety, to be obtained by any means. Be that as it may, he is the founder in Europe, not of Philosophical Anarchism, like Stirner's (*q. v.*), but of the Anarchist Communist programme of violence and terror. His writings were mainly attacks upon Marx and Mazzini, or violent *Bulletins of the Federation of the Jura.* B. R. Tucker translated his *God and the State* in 1883. Liberty, Liberty St., N. Y.

BALL, JOHN, hanged 15th July, 1381.

John Ball, "St. Mary's priest," "the mad priest of Kent," began to preach mediæval Christian Socialism about 1360. "Good people," he cried, "things will never be well in England so long as there be villeins and gentle folk. By what right are they whom we call lords greater folk than we? On what grounds have they deserved it? Why do they hold us in serfage? If we all came of the same father and mother, of Adam and Eve, how can they say or prove that they are better than we, if it be not that they make us gain for them by our toil what they spend in their pride? They are clothed in velvet, and warm in their furs and their ermines, while we are covered with rags. They have wine and spices and fine bread; we have only oat cake and straw and water to drink. They have leisure and fine houses; we have pain and labour, the rain and the wind in the fields. And yet it is of our toil that these men hold their estate." Rogers says it was largely John Ball and Wiklif's "poor priests" who, traversing England unsuspected, organised the Peasants' Revolt. Green says that in the preaching of Ball England first listened to the knell of feudalism and the declaration of the rights of man. The Peasants' Revolt broke out in June, 1381. John Ball had already been imprisoned in Maidstone Jail. The peasants released him, and he marched with them to London. Here, seizing the Tower and killing the Archbishop of Canterbury and the King's Treasurer, they retired to their homes on the promise of Richard that he would grant their rights. The king broke his promise, and hung and quartered John Ball with others, 15th July, at St. Alban's. Nevertheless, from that time serfdom practically disappears from English history.

BALLOV, ADIN, 1803-1890.

Born in Cumberland, Rhode Island, United States. He became a popular Universalist clergyman. In 1841 he founded Hopedale, a religious Communistic settlement, at Hopedale, Mass. It was successful as long as Mr. Ballov managed it, till 1856. Then a business man got Mr. Ballov's place to make money for himself, and ruined the community.

BARNETT, REV. SAMUEL A., b. 1841.

Graduated at Wadham College, Oxford. In 1872 Vicar and then Rector of St. Jude's, Whitechapel, East London. In 1883 he proposed at Oxford a University Settlement in East London, and as a result Toynbee Hall was founded, 1885. The central thought of his work is that real uplift must come mainly through personal life, though Mr. Barnett has a large conception of the function of the municipality and of all organised life. He and his devoted wife are the authors of numerous magazine articles; some of the best gathered into a book, *Practicable Socialism*, 1889.

BAX, E. BELFORT, b. 1854.

In 1882-1883 one of the founders of the Social Democratic Federation. In 1885 he left this, and, with Mr. Wm. Morris, founded the Socialist League, and edited the *Commonweal.* When the Anarchist element in this League came to predominate, Mr. Bax resigned from it, and for a while edited *Justice* for the Social Democratic Federation. He founded the new *Twentieth Century Press.* He is a barrister-at-law, and is author of *The Religion of Socialism* (1887), and *Ethics of Socialism* (1889), and other similar works of materialistic Socialist philosophy, as well as of a short history of philosophy. He is now bringing out *The Social Side of the Reformation*, in 3 vols.

BAZARD, AMAND, 1791-1832.

Born in Paris, and winning the Cross of the Legion of Honour for the part he took in the defence of Paris, 1813, he had a good position in the Prefecture of the Seine, but becoming interested in the efforts for democratic freedom, he went to the south of France, and took part in the efforts of the Carbonari. Returning to Paris, he joined the Saint Simonian School, and became its leading economist and editor of its journals, *Producteur* (1829), and the *Globe* (1831). He advocated compulsory free education, and the gratuitous giving by the State of land and capital for life tenancy *only* (so as to prevent accumulation), the State to give to each according to deeds and to receive from each according to ability. In 1828 he gave, in Paris, a long course of lectures which largely made Saint Simonianism popular. In 1831 he opposed Enfantin (*q. v.*), his colleague, at the head of the Saint Simonian School, on the question of marriage and divorce, and died of a broken heart at the division of the school. His main work is *Exposition de la Doctrine de Saint Simon*, 1830-31.

BEBEL, FERDINAND AUGUST, b. 1840.

Born near Cologne; educated as a turner. First an adherent of Schulze-Delitzsch's Co-operation, and violent opponent of Lassalle (*q. v.*); he later, under the influence of Liebknecht, became a Socialist and joined the International, being influential in bringing together the followers of Marx and Lassalle and so forming the Social Democratic Party. In 1867 he was returned to the German Diet from a Saxon constituency, and has remained in the Diet with brief exceptions ever since, although an out-spoken Socialist. He has been often imprisoned, the first time in 1869, and again, for two years, in 1872. Bebel once summarised his views thus: "We aim in the domain of politics at Republicanism, in the domain of economics at Socialism, in the domain of what is called to-day religion at Atheism". His main writings are *Woman and Socialism* (1883), enlarged edition, 1891; *Our Aims*, *Christianity and Socialism*, and *The Parliamentary Activity of the German Reichstag and the Diets.* He and Liebknecht are the acknowledged teachers of the German Socialist movement to-day.

BELLAMY, EDWARD, b. 1850.

Born in Springfield, Mass. Graduated at Union College; studied law, but soon entered journalism, writing mainly for the Springfield Union. He wrote several novels: *A Nantucket Idyl*, *Doctor Heidenhoff's Process*, etc. In 1887 he wrote *Looking Backward*, a Socialistic Utopia of Boston in the year 2000. It made him famous and became the foundation of the Nationalist movement, having a sale of over 500,000, and being translated into most European languages. In 1891 Mr. Bellamy started a weekly, *The New Nation*, which was discontinued in 1894, but with the hope of being restarted. Mr. Bellamy continues to live and write at Chicopee Falls, near Springfield, Mass.

BELLERS, JOHN, 1654-1725.

A landowner of Gloucestershire, England, and member of the Society of Friends and Quakers, In 1695 appeared his famous proposal for "Colledges of Industries," which were to be on a commercial foundation, and to prevent pauperism. In propositions for the education of waifs, for the founding of hospitals for the sick, the aged, and the blind, in his efforts to improve the condition of criminals, and to establish international arbitration, he antedates the proposals of very recent years. His Communistic Colleges were to be "an epitomy of the world".

BESANT, MRS. ANNIE, b. 1847.

Born in London. Educated a fervid Churchwoman. In 1867 she married the Rev. Frank Besant. After the severe illness and death of a child, Mrs. Besant lost her faith, and finally renounced Christianity, the Church, and, later, Theism. For years she worked with Bradlaugh, lecturing all over England, preaching Secularism and editing *The National Reformer*, and was attacked and maligned in every way. Becoming interested in social subjects, she advocated Neo-Malthusianism, and, later, Socialism. She conducted the great strike of the London match girls in 1885, and joined the Social Democratic Federation and the Fabian Society. This took her away from Mr. Bradlaugh's Individualism, but she later became interested in Theosophy and Buddhism, and has given up her Neo-Malthusianism and ceased working directly for Socialism. Her chief Socialist writing is *Modern Socialism* (1890), and she has also published numerous tracts.

BLANC, J. J. LOUIS, 1813-1882.

Born in Madrid. In 1830 he came to Paris and engaged in literary work. In 1838 he founded the *Revue de Progrès Politique, Social et Littéraire.* In this he brought out his chief work, the *Organisation du Travail* (1840). In 1841 he published his *Histoire de Dix Ans*, an indictment of Louis Philippe and his Ministers. In the Revolution of 1848 he was elected to the Provisional Government, and a procession of 200,000 working men, headed by Blanqui, offered him the Dictatorship, which he refused. He advocated Government workshops for the unemployed, and they were started. But finding that the Government was managing them with the intent of making them a failure, he denounced and exposed the scheme. In August, 1848, he was accused of accomplicity in the Communist outbreaks in May, and on being condemned fled to England. Here he lived twenty years, finishing his *Histoire de la Révolution Française* and *Histoire de la Révolution de* 1848. In 1873 he returned to Paris, and was elected Deputy for Paris, a position he held to his death, always voting with the extreme Left.

BLANQUI, LOUIS AUGUSTE, 1805-1881.

Born in Puget Theiers; came in 1824 to Paris and became a teacher, and student of law and medicine. On the breaking out of the Revolution of 1830, he took his gun and joined the cause of the people, taking his part from this date in every Paris insurrection. He edited *The Journal of the Society of the Friends of the People*, and for this was imprisoned. Complicated in the "Pulver" case, he was imprisoned for two years, in 1836, but pardoned, 1837. In 1839 he organised another insurrection, which was quickly put down, and Blanqui condemned to death, a verdict changed to imprisonment for life. Confined at Mont Saint Michel, and at Tours, he was freed by the February Revolution of 1848. By 25th February he was in Paris, and organising the "Central Republican Committee". On 15th May he was captured and imprisoned ten years at Belle Isle and in Corsica. Amnestied in 1859, he was in 1861 accused of conspiracy and imprisoned four years. When the Republic was proclaimed (September, 1870) he went to Paris and advocated the principles of the extreme Left, publishing his *La Patrie en danger*. After the Commune he was arrested by Thiers, and (1872) condemned to deportation; but on account of ill-health held in Quélern and Clairvaux, and pardoned by Grévy, 9th June, 1879. He was elected Deputy in Bordeaux, 1879, but was declared ineligible. A mystic, a revolutionist, an autocrat, Blanqui was no mean thinker, and a convinced Communist Socialist. His main writings are *L'eternité dans les Astres* (1872), *L'Armée esclave et opprimeé* (1880), *Critique sociale*, 2 vols. (appearing after his death, 1883).

BLATCHFORD, ROBERT P., 1851-

Born in Maidstone; served at trade and in the army; commenced writing for various papers, and in 1885 in the *Sunday Chronicle*, under the *nom de plume* of "Nunquam," soon declaring himself a Socialist. 12th December, 1891, he issued the first number of *Clarion*, a very popular and lively Socialist weekly. His articles have been republished in several volumes, notably *Merrie England*, which has had an enormous sale, and is now sold for 1*d*.

BLISS, W. D. P., 1856-

Born in Constantinople, Turkey; A.B. at Amherst, Mass., 1878. He entered the Congregational ministry. In 1886 he was ordained priest in the Episcopal Church. In 1888 he was nominated Lieutenant Governor by the Mass. Labour Party. In 1889 he was the main organiser and first secretary of the Society of Christian Socialists in America. In 1890 he founded *The Dawn*, which he still edits. In 1890 he also founded in Boston the Church of the Carpenter, of which he is rector. He has written many tracts, *What is Christian Socialism? What is Socialism?* etc. He is editor of the (American) *Social Science Library* and of the *Encyclopedia of Social Reform.*

BRAY, J. F.

An English Communist of the school of Owen, and author of *Labour's Wrongs and Labour's Remedy, or the Age of Might and the Age of Right* (1839), much read at the time but now almost forgotten, though mentioned by Karl Marx in his *Misery of Philosophy.*

BRISSOT DE WARVILLE, 1759-1793.

An influential writer in France before the Revolution; hung, as a Girondist, 1793; mentioned here on account of his *Recherches philosophiques sur la propriété et sur le vol* (1780), in which he anticipates Proudhon's saying that "what men call property is theft," arguing that the real right of property is only to enjoy the gratuitous fruits of nature.

BROUSSE, PAUL.

Born at Montpellier; studied medicine in Paris, becoming doctor, 1867. From 1870-1871 he worked on the *Droits de l'homme*, and in 1871 was condemned to three months' imprisonment. Escaping to Spain, he joined the Anarchistic Spanish section of the International. From Spain he went to Switzerland, and meeting Bakunin there (*q. v.*), became, under his influence, a leader of the Jura Federation, an organiser of the Anarchist section in Italy, and editor of Anarchist publications. In 1879 he suffered imprisonment in Switzerland, and after his release went to London. Here he met Marx and Engels, and renouncing Anarchism, adopted Socialism. In 1880 he returned to France, and edited *Egalité* and *Prolétaire* in 1882, with Malon and his followers, separating from the Guesdist Socialists, and forming the "Broussist" section, or so-called "Possibilists". In 1887 he was elected to the Paris Municipal Council, and has since been a foremost leader of one section of the French Socialists, but ever ready to work with any party, a policy which has resulted in his now calling himself *Republican Radical.* His main writings are *Le Suffrage universel et le problème de la souveraineté du peuple* (1874), and *La Crise* (1879).

BUONARROTTI, FILIPPO, 1761-1837.

Born in Pisa, he early fled to Corsica on account of his revolutionary ideas, and published there his *Friend of Italian Liberty*. In 1792 he came to Paris and was admitted to the title of "Citoyen français". For complication with the conspiracy of Babœuf (*q. v.*) he was condemned to deportation. After much suffering he escaped to Geneva, and later to Brussels, where he wrote his *History of Babœuf's Conspiracy* (1828). In 1830 he returned to France, and secretly worked for Communism, exerting much influence upon Blanqui and other leaders.

BURKLI, KARL, 1823-

Born at Zurich, he became a tanner, and was converted to Socialism (1845) by the writings of Fourier; he founded the first "Konsumverein" in German Switzerland, and (1851) was elected to the Cantonal Council because of his Socialist programme, and advocacy, for the first time in Switzerland, of direct legislation. Since then he has played an important part in Swiss politics as a firm Socialist. In his seventieth year he opened the Zurich International Congress. He has been a voluminous writer from 1851 to 1891.

BURNS, JOHN, 1859-

Born at Battersea; earned his own living at the age of ten in a candle factory, but was later apprenticed to a local engineering firm. An early trades unionist: he was arrested in 1877 for persistently speaking on Clapham Common. When out of his apprenticeship in 1879 he joined the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, and prominently advocated shorter hours. In 1880-81 he was engaged as an engineer in West Africa, and read Adam Smith and J. S. Mill. In 1883 he became a Socialist, and joined the Social Democratic Federation and became its leading working-class member. In 1885 he stood as Socialist candidate for Nottingham, and received 598 votes. For two years he led the "unemployed" agitation in London. In 1886 he was arrested with Hyndman and others for speaking in Hyde Park, and on acquittal his speech (*The Man with the Red Flag*) was printed and widely sold. In 1887 he was imprisoned six weeks for breaking through the police, and speaking in Trafalgar Square, 13th Nov. ("Bloody Sunday"). In 1889 he was elected to the London County Council from Battersea. The same year he showed marvellous skill in managing the Dock Strike, and in organising the unorganised, and became the foremost leader of the "New Unionism". Believing in the "Progressivist" policy of advancing Socialism through any party, he left the Social Democratic Federation, and has been much criticised by its leaders ever since. At the General Election in 1892 he was easily elected M.P. for Battersea, and in 1893, receiving the highest number of votes at the Trades Union Congress, became Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee. In 1894 he was elected to represent the English Trades Unions before the American Federation of Labour at Denver, and made a general lecture tour through the States.

BURROWS, HERBERT, 1845-

Born in Suffolk; son of a Methodist local preacher; studying at a private school, he entered the Civil Service. He was one of the original founders of the Social Democratic Federation, and is still a member. He gave himself so energetically to the cause as on occasions to deliver seven addresses a day. He was one of the organisers of the dock labourers, and has represented the Federation in several Socialist Congresses. He is now in the Civil Service, and deeply interested in Theosophy, but still true to Socialism. He is treasurer for the Match Girls' Union, and active on its behalf.

CABET, ETIENNE, 1788-1856.

Born at Dijon; student of law and medicine; his father a patriot connected with the Carbonari. In 1820 he went to Paris and took part in the Revolution of 1830. An extreme Republican, he was tried for his views, condemned, and fled to England. Converted to Communism through reading More's *Utopia*, he wrote in London and published in France, in 1840, his communistic romance, *Voyage en Icarie.* It created great interest, and a colony was started to carry out its ideas. Cabet bought a million acres in Texas, and fifty-nine pioneers set sail in 1848 for New Orleans. Their ranks were decimated by fever, and they had decided to return when they met Cabet at New Orleans. He, with 280 followers, went to Navoo, Ill., and commenced his colony in 1849. Accused in France of fraud, he returned to Paris, and was acquitted. Returning to Navoo, he found the colony prosperous. In 1855 it had 500 members. Dissensions, however, arose; and Cabet, with 200 followers, went to St. Louis, where he died. His colony still survives on a small scale at Icaria, Iowa. Besides his romance Cabet wrote *Le vrai christianisme suivant Jésus Christ*, and other books, arguing that Christianity is Communism.

CAMPANELLA, TOMMASO, 1568-1639.

A Dominican monk, of Calabria, and Italian patriot. Imprisoned in Naples twenty-seven years for his advocacy of Communism; he was repeatedly tortured to make him confess his heresy, but without avail. Here he wrote several books, especially *The City of the Sun* a Socialistic Utopia. When released, on the petition of Pope Urban VIII., he went to Rome and then Paris, where he received a pension and the friendship of Richelieu. His *City of the Sun* is in the form of a dialogue between a sea captain and a knight templar, and its ideas largely resemble those of Plato's *Republic.* A translation is in Morley's Universal Library.

CARPENTER, EDWARD, 1844-

Born at Brighton, Sussex. Educated at Brighton College and Trinity Hall, Cambridge. Elected to a fellowship there, he became curate to F. D. Maurice at St. Edward's, Cambridge. He resigned his fellowship and curacy about 1871 owing to a change of views, and became a University Extension lecturer on Science, Music, etc. He has written *Towards Democracy* (1883), *England's Ideal* (1887, new edition 1895), *Civilisation, its Cause and Cure* (1889), with other literary works and poems. He has twice visited America. Like Thoreau, he lives in almost hermit-like, yet artistic, simplicity, a life close to man and to nature.

CASSON, HERBERT N., 1869-

Born in Ontario, Canada, of English parents. Educated at Victoria College, he entered the Methodist ministry in 1890. Becoming a Socialist he gave up both Church and Creed, came to Boston, Mass., in 1893, and took a leading part in the agitation for the unemployed. In January, 1894, he moved to Lynn, Mass., and founded (in America) the Labour Church Movement, which has since spread to other towns. He is known as a Socialist speaker and writer.

The principles of the Labour Church (in America), which must be quite distinguished from the Christian Socialist Movement, are as follows :—

1. God is the cause and strength of the Labour Movement, and whatever institution or individual opposes the Labour Movement opposes Him.
2. All who are working for the abolition of wage-slavery are, consciously or unconsciously, working together with Him, and are therefore members of the real Church.
3. The improvement of personal character and of social conditions are both necessary to secure freedom from moral and social bondage.
4. All that is good in the present Christian Church, and in the history of our country, is on the side of the working man in his struggle for Justice and Brotherhood.

Its so-called " Ten Commandments " are as follows :—

1. Thou shalt earn thine own living, and not live on rent, profits, or interest.
2. Thou shalt help others in proportion to their weakness, ignorance, or poverty.
3. Thou shalt make the highest possible use of thy vote,—regarding it as a most sacred trust.
4. Thou shalt look upon the working men of all countries as thy brethren.
5. Thou shalt endeavour to prevent and abolish war.
6. Thou shalt treat private luxury as immoral, as long as poverty exists.
7. Thou shalt resist and overthrow all injustice, tyranny, and social evil.
8. Thou shalt regard the duties and happiness of the present as supreme.
9. Thou shalt seek thine own welfare in advancing the welfare of all.
10. Thou shalt reverence these three,—God, the Father; Man, the Son; and Love, the Holy Spirit.

CLARKE, WILLIAM, 1856-

Born at Norwich. B.A., Cambridge. Historical Tripos, 1876. He lectured on economics, and wrote numerous articles for the leading reviews. In 1890 he became connected with the London *Daily Chronicle*, a position he still holds. A prominent member of the Fabian Society, he was delegate to the Paris Labour Congress of 1889. In 1893 he visited the United States, and gave numerous lectures on Socialism and Literature. His best-known book is a study of Walt Whitman and his democracy.

COLINS, JEAN GUILLAUME CÉSAR ALEXANDRE HIPPOLYTE DE, 1783-1859.

Born in Brussels, and educated at home by a Jesuit; he became a physician, and established himself (1819) in Havana. After the Paris Revolution of 1830 he went to Paris and gave himself up to scientific studies. In 1835 he brought out his first work, *Le pacte sociale*, and then *Qu'est que la science sociale?* (4 vols., 1853-54), *L'Economie politique* (3 vols., 1856-57), *La Société nouvelle, sa necessité* (2 vols., 1857), *Science sociale* (6 vols., 1857). Colins taught that all immovable property should be held in common, and became the founder of a school of so-called " Rational Socialism ". His religious ideas were a strange combination of Atheism and Spiritualism.

COMMONS, PROF. J. R., 1862-

Born at Hollandsburg, Ohio. A.B. at Oberlin, 1888. Student at Johns Hopkins University. A.M., Oberlin, 1890. Tutor in economics at Wesleyan University, 1890-91. Associate professor of political economy at Oberlin, 1891-92. Since then professor of political economy at Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. One of the founders of the American Proportional Representation League. Secretary of the American Institute of Christian Sociology. Author of *Distribution of Wealth* (1893), and *Social Reform and the Church.* Prof. Commons is not a Socialist, but, like Prof. Ely, has done work for social reform which Socialists believe to be in the direction of their aims.

COMTE, AUGUSTE, 1797-1857.

Born 19th January, in Montpellier; from 1832 to 1851 adjunct professor in the Ecole Polytechnique at Paris. He is the founder of Positivism; his *Cours de Philosophie Positive* appearing in 1830-1842, and his *Système de Politique Positive*, 1851-57. According to Comte every science must either be (1) physico-mathematical, (2) biological, or (3) sociological; and must go through three stages, (1) theological, (2) metaphysical, (3) positive. He was the first writer to use the word Sociology, and with his conception of the solidarity of the phenomena of civil life has had a decidedly socialistic influence upon his school. See Ingram's *History of Political Economy*, and Cossa's *Introduction to Political Economy.*

CONSIDERANT, PROSPER VICTOR, 1808-

Born at Salins; student at the Polytechnique at Paris, and became a Chief of Engineers. In 1831 he left the service to spread Fourierism, and published the chief work of this school, *Destinée Sociale* (3 vols., 1834-45). Soon after he established a "Phalanx" which existed till 1845. In the last year of the Government of Louis Philippe, he established a journal, *La Democratie Pacifique.* In 1848 he was elected to the Constituent Assembly, and laboured with Louis Blanc for the recognition of the right to work. After the overthrow of the Republic, he was sentenced to deportation; he escaped to Brussels, where he found friends and money to set up a Fourierist Phalanx in Texas. He established this under the name of "La Rêunion," but it was broken up by the war of the Rebellion. In 1869 he returned to Paris, and lived a comparatively retired life. His writings are too numerous to mention here, the above named being the best known.

CRANE, WALTER, 1845-

Born in Liverpool, and apprenticed to a wood engraver. In 1879 he was appointed examiner of the National Competition of Drawings at South Kensington. He became a member of the Institute of Painters in Water Colour, but resigned in 1873. In 1888 he was president of the Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society. His chief fame is as a designer, though his paintings and lectures on art are also important. In 1884 he became interested in Socialism, chiefly of the school of Morris, and has spoken and written much for the cause, contributing also many designs for Socialist societies and publications.

DEARMER, REV. PERCY.

Educated at Christ Church, Oxford, now curate of St. John's, Great Marlborough Street, London. He is the energetic secretary of the London branch of the Christian Social Union, and is on the Council of the Guild of St. Matthew. He had a share in Andrew Reid's *New Party*, where he proclaimed the Socialism of the position of the Church of England.

DONI, ANTON FRANCESCO.

Author of an eccentric Utopia, *Mondi celesti terrestri ed infernali* (Florence, 1552-53).

ELY, PROF. RICHARD T., 1857-

Born at Ripley, New York. A.B., Columbia, 1876. Ph.D., Heidelberg, 1879. Professor of political economy at Johns Hopkins University till 1892, when he became director of the School of Economics, Political Science, and History at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, U.S. He was one of the founders of the American Economic Association, of the Christian Social Union, and of the American Institute of Christian Sociology, of which last he is president. His main works are *French and German Socialism* (1883); *Labour Movement in America* (1886); *Taxation in American States and Cities* (1888, based on Dr. Ely's experience in the Baltimore City Tax Commission, and in the Maryland State Tax Commission, 1886-88); *Problems of To-day* (1888); *Introduction to Political Economy* (1889), enlarged edition (1893); *Social Aspects of Christianity* (1889); *Socialism and Social Reform* (1894); *Socialism: its Strength and Weakness* (1894). Dr. Ely is often called a Socialist, but does not call himself one, though a strong believer in, and worker for, the socialisation of "Natural Monopolies".

ENFANTIN, BARTHOLOMÉ PROSPER, 1789-1864.

A Saint Simonian, who acted as "supreme father" to the movement in its somewhat fantastical religious developments after the death of Saint Simon (1825). In 1831 the Saint Simonian School attempted Communism on some property of Enfantin's at Menilnontant. Enfantin's eccentric ideas about marriage and divorce brought the school into an evil report, not overcome by the plain words of Bazard (*q. v.*) against Enfantin. His main works are *Economie politique et politique Saint Simonienne* (1831), and *La Religion Saint Simonienne* (1831).

ENGELS, FRIEDRICH, 1818-

Born at Bremen. In 1843 he met Marx at Paris, and for forty years was his life-long friend and fellow-worker. In 1848 he published with Marx the famous Communistic Manifesto. Banished from Prussia in 1849. In 1845 he published in German his *Condition of the English Working Classes in* 1844 (translated by Fouver Kelley, with new Preface, London, 1892). His other main works are *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigenthums und des Staates* (1891), and *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific* (1892), a translation of the German edition of 1891. He has also edited Aveling's translation of

Marx's *Kapital*. Engels has mainly lived and is now living in London, writing and working with Marx till his death.

FICHTE, JOHANN GOTTLIEB, 1762-1814.

Born at Rammenau in Lusatia. He studied theology and then philosophy at Jena. In 1791 he met Kant and became a Kantian. In 1792 he wrote his *Critique of all Revelation*. In 1794, after considerable suffering and want, he was made Professor of Philosophy at Jena. He left Kantianism and developed a spiritual idealism. In 1799 he was deprived of his chair on a charge of Atheism. He lectured at Berlin, and in 1805 was made professor of Philosophy at Erlangen. Here he published *The Nature of the Scholar*, and became deeply interested in social and political questions, and a firm patriot. He was elected rector of the University of Berlin. On the outbreak of the War of Independence of 1810, his wife became a hospital nurse, but caught a fever, and recovered only to bequeath it to her husband, who died 3rd January, 1814. His chief social writings are *Materials for the Justification of the French Revolution*, *Principles of Natural Right* (1796), *The State in Accordance with Right*. He was much influenced by Rousseau, and accepts the doctrine of Individual Sovereignty and the Social Contract. Property is the result of the work of the Ego; but if a man can find no work he need not respect private property, since in his case the State has not fulfilled its contract. Labour and distribution should be collectively organised. All the positions of modern Socialism are outlined in his writings, modified by an individualistic philosophy and a deep pietistic Christianity.

FLÜRSCHEIM, MICHAEL, 1844-

Born at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and well educated there; worked in banking offices in Frankfort, Berlin, and Paris, till 1869. He then went to the United States, and engaged in business in New York and Virginia as importer, manufacturer, and investor. In 1872, returned to Germany, and engaged in journalistic enterprise (*The American News*). In 1873 purchased the Gaggina iron works, and conducted them with great success for fifteen years, when he organised a limited company. He introduced many improvements, attempted some co-operative experiments, employed 1000 men, and had at one time over 100 patents. In 1883 he began to devote part of his time to social reform, influenced mainly by Henry George. In 1889 published (in German) *By Peaceful Means*. In 1887 founded the weekly *Deutsch*

Land, and edited it till 1889, when he turned it over to the German Land Nationalisation League, which he founded in 1888. He also led to the formation of similar leagues in Switzerland and Holland. In 1889 he brought out (in German) *The Only Way of Salvation*, and in 1891 (in English) *Rent, Wages, and Interest.* He is now writing *Building Stones for Social Reform.* He believes in Land Nationalisation, but not in the Single Tax, which he considers confiscation. He believes in the monopolisation by the State of commerce and land distribution, and for money would have only State warrant money. In production he would have private competition. With land and commerce nationalised he believes interest proper (*i.e.*, interest less risk premium) would cease.

FOURIER, FRANÇOIS CHARLES MARIE, 1772-1837.

Born at Besançon. Well educated, and much travelled. Losing his property in the Revolution, he served five years in the army, and later entered business in Lyons. In 1803 he published an article on European politics. Becoming interested in social questions, he published his *Théorie des Quatre Mouvements* (2 vols., 1808). He believed that the full indulgence of human nature, with all its passions, would produce happiness and virtue. Society he would harmoniously organise in groups (phalanx) of 1600 persons, to inhabit a philanstery, a certain proportion to do one kind of work, others other kinds, and to regulate their time so as to harmoniously develop all sides of life. In 1822 he published his *Traité de l'Association Agricole Domestique.* He went to Paris to become clerk in an American firm. In 1829 he published *Le Nouveau Monde Industriel.* In 1831 he attacked the school of St. Simon (*q. v.*). He now began to gain followers, particularly Victor Considerant (*q. v.*), who published in 1834 his *Destinée Sociale*, the most important work of this school. In 1837 a newspaper was attempted, and, with many interruptions, published, till it was suppressed in 1850. In 1832 Baudet Dulary became a convert, and proceeded to establish a philanstery at Condé sur Visgre, but it soon failed. Fourier, till he died, expected some rich man to found a successful phalanx. Fourierism in America had many and notable experiments. (See chapter on Socialism in the United States.)

GALL, HEINRICH LUDWIG LAMPERT, 1790-1863.

Seligman's and Hugo's *Handbuch des Socialismus* calls him "the first German Socialist". A rare and almost forgotten writer, yet "the first in Germany to raise his voice for modern Socialism". Born in Aldhoven bei Jülich, 28th December, 1790; held various clerkships in Government offices in Cleve, Düsseldorf, Luxemburg, and especially at Treves. The sufferings of the people after the war of 1815 moved him deeply; and even at this time he clearly analysed the industrial situation and the social evolution which puts all power into the hands of capitalists, who were as capitalists not workers, and left the workers poor. Doing what he could to spread his ideas he met with no encouragement, and in 1819 left his government situation to devote all his time and his considerable means to the service of social reform. He conducted to America an ill-fated, ill-planned company of the offscourings of German cities (thieves, convicts, and harlots), and with the best of them organised a colony at Harrisburg, Pa. He believed he could make of them successful colonists; but naturally he failed, exhausting his means, and receiving only criticism and opposition. Returning he entered the government service once again, and made numerous inventions in distilling apparatus, etc., all to get the means to carry on his propaganda. He travelled in England and France, meeting Owen, Fourier, and the Saint Simonians, and tried to form an international movement. He travelled all through Germany even to East Prussia, oppressed with the condition of the masses. In 1828 he published a paper, *Menschenfreundliche Blätter* (Humanitarian Leaflet), but was compelled to discontinue it for lack of support. He wrote many books, especially *Mein Wollen und Mein Werken* (1835), in which he outlines the principles of modern Socialism, the helplessness of the individual worker, the need of industrial organisation by the workers. Condemned to imprisonment in one of his travels, he fled to Treves, where he died 31st January, 1863. See Seligman's and Hugo's *Handbuch des Socialismus* for a full account of him.

GEORGE, HENRY, 1839-

Born in Philadelphia. As a lad went to sea. In California he became a printer, a reporter, and then a journalist. In 1871 he, with others, founded the *San Francisco Post*. He wrote his *Our Land and Land Policy* in 1871. In 1877 he published *Progress and Poverty*, and became famous. In 1880 he published the *Irish Land Question*, and in 1881 visited Ireland as a newspaper correspondent. In 1883 he visited England and lectured in the principal cities amidst an enthusiasm to which many ascribe the awakening that has occasioned the present English Socialist movement. In 1886 Mr. George was nominated Mayor of New York; and, after a phenomenal campaign, polled 68,000 votes, being defeated only by the Democratic candidate. A Union Labour Party and Anti-Poverty Society were formed to represent the political and religious sides of the movement. In 1887 the United Labour Party nominated him Governor. Up to this time Mr. George, though not a Socialist, had not declared against the Socialists, and they had supported him. In the nominating convention Mr. George now declared against them, and ever since the American Socialists have bitterly denounced him. He polled but a small vote. Mr. George has since worked with the Democratic Party for Free Trade, on the ground that protective duties must be repealed before taxation can be concentrated on land values. In 1887 he commenced publishing the *Standard*, but discontinued it in 1890. His principal other books besides those above mentioned are *Social Problems* (1884), *Protection or Free Trade* (1887), *The Condition of Labour* (1891), an open letter to the Pope on the occasion of his Encyclical.

GIDE, PROF. CHARLES, 1847-

From 1874-1880 Professor of Jurisprudence at Bordeaux, and since 1880 Professor of Political Economy at Montpellier. His chief works are his *Principes d'Economie Politique* (1889), which has been translated into English (1891), and *L'Ecole Nouvelle* (1890). He is one of the leaders among French Economists of what he calls the school of "solidarity," the revolt (represented by the *Revue d'Economie Politique* (1887)) against the orthodox political economy. He is by no means a Socialist, but has been particularly active in the movement of French Protestant Christian Socialism, which means, however, little more than the study of social questions from a Christian standpoint.

GLASSE, REV. JOHN.

Minister of the church of Old Greyfriars, Edinburgh, and a pioneer of Socialism in Scotland.

GOBLET, RENÉ MARIE, 1828-

Born at Aire, he entered the legal profession, then journalism, and, later, politics. In 1870 he was Procureur-General at Amiens; in 1871 representative for La Somme, being a Republican of the Left, and though at first a supporter of the Government, he gradually became more and more independent. From January to August, 1882, he held the portfolio of the Interior in the Freycinet Cabinet; from April, 1885, to January, 1886, the portfolio of Public Instruction and of the Arts, under Brisson. In 1886 to 1887 he was President of the Council; and from April, 1888, to April, 1889, Minister of Foreign Affairs. In the last general election he declared out and out for Socialism, and is considered the leading Socialist in French Government circles.

GODIN, JEAN BAPTISTE ANDRÉ, 1817-1888.

Born at Esqubirus of a family of artisans. Early engaging in industry, he, in 1847, moved his works to Guise, and became interested in Co-operation as a disciple of Fourier. In 1859 he commenced his famous *Familistere*, or communal home, and rapidly developed it. In 1870 he was elected Mayor of Guise, and in 1871 representative for Aisne. In 1871 he also published his *Solutions Sociales*, or account of his *Familistere.* The *Familistere* in 1888 had thirteen *associés*, sixty-seven *societaires*, fifty-two *participants*, out of 1237 *employées.* The industry carried on is the making of stoves, ovens, and smaller hardware. There are three big buildings with 1800 inhabitants, each family having two or three rooms. Much attention is given to education. Babies can be left by their mothers in a crèche from 7 A.M. to 7 P.M. There is considerable social life. The firm is now Dequenne et Compagnie, M. Dequenne being managing director for life.

GODWIN, WILLIAM, 1756-1836.

Educated as a nonconformist clergyman. Resigning the ministry he came to London to write, and in 1793 published his *Inquiry concerning Political Justice.* In 1797 he married Mary Wollstoncraft, the brilliant advocate of woman's rights and popular liberties. She died in giving birth to the second wife of Shelley. Godwin married Mrs. Clairmont in 1800, and wrote novels and histories for his support; till, modifying his views, he received a pension, though still continuing to write. Godwin was an intense individualist. He attacked the institutions of marriage, accumulation of property, the infliction of punishment, etc., etc. He seems to have excited a profound influence on the younger men of his time, on extremely Radical lines. His *Political Justice* has been recently reprinted, edited by H. S. Salt, 1890.

GREELEY, HORACE, 1811-1872.

Born in Amherst, N. H. As a boy he worked as a day labourer, then in a printing office at East Poultney, Vt., for $40 a year. In 1831 he went to New York City. In 1833, with F. V. Story, he commenced the *Morning Post*, then the *New Yorker*, and the *Log Cabin*, which last was a success. In 1841 he founded the *New York Tribune*, and opened its columns to every reform—dress reform, vegetarianism, etc. He allowed Brisbane to advocate Fourierism, and became himself deeply and actively interested in the Fourierist North American Phalanx. His main efforts, however, were soon concentrated upon the Abolitionist movement. In 1848-49 he was a Whig representative in Congress. In 1861 he was one of the founders of the Republican party. Opposing Grant's administration, he was, in 1872, nominated for President by the Liberal Republican party. He took his defeat so grievously as to lead to his death.

GRONLUND, LAWRENCE, 1848-

Born in Denmark. He studied law, but came to America in 1867 and taught German in Milwaukee. In 1869 he was admitted to the bar in Chicago. In 1880 he published a dialogue on *The Coming Revolution;* then his *Co-operative Commonwealth* (1884), *Ca Ira*, a life of Danton (1888), *Our Destiny* (1891). Mr. Gronlund has lived successively in New York, Boston, and Washington, working incessantly for Socialism with his pen and by lectures.

GRUN, KARL, 1817-1887.

Born at Lüdenscheid in Westphalia. A Hegelian; he became editor of a Mannheim journal in 1842, and advocated Socialistic views till expelled from the duchy. After 1868 he lived in Vienna, writing various literary and philosophical works.

GUESDE, JULES (BASILE), 1845-

Born at Paris, and educated by his father. At the age of twenty he entered political journalism, and, in Paris, Toulouse and Montpellier, wrote against monarchy. Here he brought out his *Rights of Man*, and was imprisoned six months for an article calling for a revolution. A follower of the Commune, he made a fruitless attempt to stir up a revolution at Montpellier. Condemned in 1871 to five years' imprisonment, he fled to Geneva and founded a section of the International, without taking sides in the struggle between Marx and

Bakunin. Driven to Italy, he, in 1876, made his way to Paris, and worked on the journals *Droits de l'Homme*, *Le Radical*, and *Le Citoyen*. In 1879 he, with others, founded the *Egalité*. He is leader of Marxist Socialism. In 1887 he became editor-in-chief of *Cri du Peuple*, and in 1889 of *Egalité*. His main works are *Collectivisme et Revolution* (1879), *Services public et Socialisme* (1883), *Le Collectivisme au Collège de France* (1883).

HARDIE, J. KEIR, 1836-

Born in Glasgow. At the age of eight he worked in the coal pits. Educating himself as best he could, he worked his way up and became Secretary of the Miners' Union in Lanarkshire. In 1882 he took to journalism as sub-editor of the *Cumnock News*. In 1888 he stood for Parliament in Mid Lanark, but was defeated. He then founded the Scotch Labour Party. In 1892 he was returned for South West Ham. An earnest speaker and worker, he is the leading spirit in the Independent Labour Party formed about 1891, and to this he has given his latest efforts. He is main editor of the *Labour Leader*, the organ of the party.

HARRINGTON, JAMES, 1611-1677.

Educated at Oxford, he became a personal attendant upon Charles I. In 1656 he published his *Oceana*, an allegory depicting a Socialistic Republic. In 1661 he was arrested on a charge of treason, and confined, without trial, till he became insane and died.

HEADLAM, REV. STEWART, 1847-

Born at Wavertree, near Liverpool, he was educated at Walhurst, Eton, and Trinity College, Cambridge. He read for ordination with the Rev. Herbert James at Livermere, Bury St. Edmunds, and Dr. Vaughan at the Temple. He was curate of St. John's, Drury Lane, from 1870-73; St. Matthew's, Bethnal Green, 1873-78; St. Thomas', Charterhouse, 1880-81; St. Michael's, Shoreditch, 1881-84; and he is now warden of the Guild of St. Matthew, and member of the London School Board for the division of Hackney. Mr. Headlam had to resign his Bethnal Green curacy on account of a lecture on theatres and music which he delivered to a working man's club in the parish. This lecture gave serious offence to the late Bishop of London. The present Bishop of London also refuses Mr. Headlam a licence in the diocese on account of his support of stage dancing; and Mr. Headlam has thus suffered in his whole professional career for his ideas.

Nevertheless, few priests in London exert more influence for Christianity and the Church. Mr. Headlam is the author of several small but remarkable volumes of sermons and lectures, *Priestcraft and Progress*, *The Laws of Eternal Life*, *Lessons from the Cross*, *Salvation through Christ*, *Christian Socialism*, etc. He has also edited part of Carlo Blesis' work on dancing, under the title, *The Theory of Theatrical Dancing*. He has written an essay on "The Function of the Stage," and is now issuing the paper on the ballet which he lately read to the Playgoers' Club. Mr. Headlam also edits, and contributes to, *The Church Reformer*, a Christian Socialist paper, which is published monthly. He is a frequent lecturer for the Guild of St. Matthew, the English Land Restoration League, the Fabian Society, and the Church and Stage Guild. But much of his chief work is on the London School Board in connection with educational reform, on which—as, indeed, on all subjects in which he is interested—he is an eloquent speaker.

HEGEL, G. W. F., 1770-1831.

Born at Stuttgart, he studied at Tübingen with Schelling· Professor at Jena, Heidelberg, and Berlin. His principal works are *Die Phenomenologie des Geistes* (1807), the *Logik* (1812-16), an *Encyclopedie der Philosoph. Wissenschaften* (1817), *Philosophie des Rechtes* (1821). He early in life turned his attention to social questions, writing a commentary on Stewart's *Inquiry into the Principles of Political Economy*. Later he published various small works on the political constitutions of Würtemberg and Germany. He admired Napoleon, "that universal genius". In his philosophy, rejecting the idea of the Absolute, and conceiving of everything, even of God, as progress, he thinks of society as developing through the individual, the family, the town, the state, the world, higher and higher unities, each unity, however, realising, and not destroying, the lower unity. It is easy to see how he came to be the father of the Socialistic philosophy of Marx, Bakunin, and of all the first German Socialists.

HERTZKA, THEODORE, 1845-

Born in Buda Pesth; studied in Vienna. In 1872 editor of the *Neue Freien Presse;* 1880, superintendent of the *Weiner Allgemeine Zeitung*. The same year he brought out his *Laws of Trade* (*Die Gesetze der Handelspolitik*) from the standpoint of the orthodox economy, which, however, he wholly gave up six years later in his *Laws of Social Evolution*. A still further advance is made in his Utopia of

Freiland (1890), in which he pictures a colony in equatorial Africa on the principles of Communism. At the end of this volume he called for the creation of such a colony, and met with a large response. By 1891 the book had been translated into many languages, and some 1000 local unions had been formed to provide the means and start the colony. A central committee was organised, and in 1893 a start actually made. It may be too early to judge of the results, but reports are already spreading of the failure of the attempt. Most Socialists believe that Socialism must come in through evolution, not through colonies.

HOLLAND, CANON SCOTT.

After residence of some years at Oxford, he became a canon of St. Paul's. He is one of the foremost leaders of the Anglican Church. Besides his notable share in *Lux Mundi*, he has written many books, such as *In Behalf of Belief*, and *The City of God.* He founded the English Christian Social Union in 1889, and is president of the energetic London Branch, an outspoken leader of the new Christian Socialism.

HUBER, VICTOR AIMÉ, 1800-1869.

Born in Stuttgart. He studied medicine at Göttingen, but travelled much. He became deeply interested in social subjects from a Christian standpoint. In 1838 Friedrich Wilhelm IV. invited him to Berlin, to establish a Christian State Socialistic paper, the *Janus.* He made it a vehicle for teaching his pet scheme of Co-operation. After the March Revolution of 1848 it was discontinued, and Huber formed an "Association of Christian Order and Liberty". He also interested himself in Co-operative Building Societies. Receiving little support in Berlin, he retired to a simple life in the Hartz Mountains, whence he issued to preach Co-operation or Christian Socialism in Germany, France, Belgium, and England.

HUET, FRANÇOIS, 1814-1869.

Born at Villeau. Professor of Philosophy at Ghent (1836-1850). In 1846 he became deeply interested in social questions and gathered a circle of pupils, among whom was De Laveleye. He would have all hereditary property divided equally among all people. In the organisation of labour he was an Individualist, and did not believe in State activity. His *La Règne social du christianisme* (1858) contains a complete social theory based on liberal Christianity. Laveleye says of it: "It has not met the attention it deserves, only because it is too full of Christianity for the Socialists, and too full of Socialism for Christians". In 1864 he published *La science de l'esprit.*

HYNDMAN, HENRY MAGUS, 1842-

Graduated at Trinity, Cambridge, 1864. In the Italian campaign of 1866 he was special correspondent for the *Pall Mall Gazette.* From 1868 to 1870 he travelled in the United States and Australia. In 1877 he published *The Indian Famine and the Crisis in India.* In 1880 he contested the Parliamentary seat of Marylebone. In 1881 he was the chief founder of the Democratic Federation, which soon became the Social Democratic Federation. In 1881 he published *England for All;* in 1883, *The Historical Basis of Socialism;* in 1884, *The Social Reconstruction of England*, and *A Summary of the Principles of Socialism;* and in 1892, *Commercial Crises of the Nineteenth Century.* In 1886 he was tried with Burns, Champion, and Williams for uttering sedition, and inciting to violence, on Trafalgar Square; after three days' trial all were acquitted. He is still the leading member of the Social Democratic Federation, and constantly contributes to *Justice*, its organ. A man of some means, no one has more absolutely devoted his whole life to the cause of Socialism.

KAUFMANN, REV. M.

Born in Germany, he early came to England, and graduated at Trinity, Dublin. Taking orders in the Church of England, he is now rector of Ingworth, and vicar of Calthorpe. He has been a lifelong student of Socialism, and has written numberless magazine articles and accounts of Socialism, with several books, such as *Christian Socialism* (1888), *Utopias from Sir Thomas More to Karl Marx*, *Socialism and Communism* (1883).

KAUTSKY, KARL.

A leading Socialist in Germany, editor of *Die Neue Zeitung* of Stuttgart, the leading German Socialist Review. Also, with E. Bernstein, editor of *Die Geschichte des Sozialismus*, now appearing in parts. He has been a voluminous writer. Among his books are *Thomas More und seine Utopie; Der Arbeiterschutz, besonders die internationale Arbeiterschutz; Gesetzgebung und der Achtstundentag; Die Klassengesätze von* 1789; *Karl Marx, Oekonomische Lehren, Das Erfurter Programm in seinem grundsätzlichen Theil; Der Parlamentarismus, der Volksgesetzgebung und die Sozialdemokratie.*

KETTELER, WILHELM EMMANUEL F. VON, 1811-1875.

Born at Münster; he was educated there, later under the Jesuits at Brug, and at the Universities of Göttingen, Heidelberg, and München. He entered the public service as "Referendar" from 1834-38, but siding with the Church against the State, he studied under Döllinger, and was made priest in 1844. He was very popular and untiring in his work in his parish, especially during an epidemic, and was elected to the Germanic Parliament at Frankfurt. In 1848 he preached at Mainz on social subjects to five or six thousand people, and in 1850 was made Bishop of Mainz. He was untiring in his devotion to his people. He started various Church associations for working men, and is considered the founder of the Catholic Socialism in Germany, a movement which, though of some size and political influence, is quite different from English Christian Socialism. His main social writing is *Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum.*

KIDD, BENJAMIN, 1858-

Leaving school at the age of seventeen, he read for six years under private tutors, first for the Indian Civil Service, and later, for the Chinese Consular Service, obtaining in the meantime (1877) an appointment in the home Civil Service, London. In the course of his reading he became deeply interested in biology, making this a speciality, having colonies of ants and bees in his study, and following closely all work in the leading departments of biology. As a result, though keeping his Civil Service appointment, he has not gone abroad, but devotes his time out of office hours to biology. He has followed closely the Weismann controversy, and believed from the first that it bore directly on sociological subjects. He has been a frequent contributor to the magazines, not always over his name, his articles appearing in *The Nineteenth Century*, *Review of Reviews*, *The English Illustrated*, *Cornhill*, *Longman's* and other magazines. His first book, *Social Evolution* (1894), arguing, from a biological standpoint, that religion has a large part to play in the development of society, and that the tendency of the times is not to Socialism but to a radical extension of State control, to prevent monopoly and maintain competition, is thought by many to mark an epoch in social biological study.

KINGSLEY, REV. CHARLES, 1819-1875.

Born at Dartmoor, Devon. A.B. at Magdalen College, Cambridge. In 1842 ordained curate at Eversley in Hampshire. In 1860 appointed

Professor of History at Cambridge; he resigned in 1869. He was made canon at Chester, and in 1873 at Westminster. He died at Eversley. In 1849 he threw himself into the Christian Socialist movement with Maurice, being greatly moved by the Chartist uprising and the suffering of the people. He wrote much in the *Christian Socialist* and *Politics for the People*, calling himself "a Chartist Parson," or "Parson Lot". With Maurice he advocated, and tried to establish, Co-operative shops; in politics he was a Tory, with sympathies for the people. His best work for social reform was his novels *Alton Locke* (1849) and *Yeast* (1849). His *Cheap Clothes and Nasty* is a scathing denunciation of the sweating system. Later in life his social views were greatly modified, and his social efforts devoted to hygiene and sanitation.

KROPOTKINE, PETER ALEXEIEVITCH, 1842-

Born of a Russian noble family, he studied at St. Petersburg, and in 1862 joined a regiment of Cossacks as lieutenant, and travelled for five years in Eastern Siberia, collecting geological and geographical information. In 1867 he returned to St. Petersburg, studying science, and as Secretary to the Geographical Society. In 1872 he paid a visit to Belgium, and became interested in the International, along with Bakunin, the founder of Anarchist Communism. Returning to Russia he joined the revolutionary circles, and gave many secret lectures. Arrested at last he was confined in the prison of St. Peter and St. Paul, but at the request of leading scientists he was allowed to continue his writings on the *Glacial Period*. His health failing, he was transferred to the Military Hospital, whence in 1876 he escaped to England. In 1877 he went to Switzerland; in 1879 he founded the paper *La Révolte* at Geneva (in 1885 transferred to Paris). Expelled from here, he was arrested in 1882 in Sardinia, and in Lyons in 1889, and condemned to five years' imprisonment, but was liberated by the President of the French Republic. In 1886 he helped to found the English Anarchist Communist paper *Freedom*. He has since resided at Harrow-on-the-Hill, near London. He takes high rank as a geographer and geologist; he is the leader of the Anarchist movement in England. His title of prince he repudiates. He has written many articles and tracts: *Paroles d'un Révolté* (1885), *Coming Anarchy* (1887), *Scientific Basis of Anarchy* (1887), *Appeal to the Young* (1890), etc., etc.

KRASSER, DR. FRIEDRICH, 1818-

Says the (English) Labour Report on Hungary: "Dr. Friedrich Krasser was perhaps the first to spread Socialist ideas broadcast in Hungary. He was born in 1818 in Mühlbach, a small town in the Saxon district of Siebenbürgen (Transylvania). His medical studies took him in due course of time to Vienna and thence to Paris, where he came in contact with the ideas of the revolutionary leaders of 1830 and 1848. In 1848 he went to Roumania, and two years later settled down in Hermannstadt (*Nagyszeben*). The 'fine enthusiasm for all ideal human effort, shown from his youth upwards by Krasser, and daily realised until the present time, he owes first to his parents, and secondly to his studies in the German, French, English, and Italian classics. The racial distinctions within Siebenbürgen, which familiarised him as a child with the Magyar, the German, and the Roumanian peoples, further, the early acquaintance with other nations by his travels in Western Europe, which taught him the subordinate importance of national and linguistic differences, had made him cosmopolitan.' Up till his fiftieth year, however, like so many Socialists of his class, he had hardly done more than give himself up to the teachings, first of the French Utopian Socialists, secondly of Marx. But when a branch of the General Workmen's Sick Fund was established in Hermannstadt in 1869, and he was appointed as doctor to the fund, he came in direct touch with the working classes, and from that time began his personal influence on the Socialist labour movement in Kronstadt, Broos, Hermannstadt, and other towns of south-eastern Hungary. His songs 'Marseillaise des Christenthums,' 'Erwacht,' and many others have been scattered in millions of leaflets through the country, in the Magyar as well as the German language."

LAMENNAIS, HUGUES FÉLICITÉ ROBERT DE, 1782-1854.

Born in St. Malo, France. Son of a shipbuilder. At first sceptical, the materialism of France drove him to the Church, and he received the tonsure in 1811, and became teacher at St. Malo. Supporting monarchy, he attacked Napoleon, and was compelled to flee to England. Returning to France, he published, in 1817, his *Indifference in Matters of Religion*, and became famous. In 1830 he founded the journal *L'Avenir*, with the motto "God and Liberty, the Pope and the People". He had many disciples, among them Lacordaire and Montalembert. Brought into trouble with the Pope in 1831, he went to Rome and waited seven months in vain for an audience. His faith shaken by what he saw, he hovered between Romanism and Democracy. On 15th August, 1832, a papal encyclical indirectly condemned *L'Avenir*, and drove Lamennais from the Church. After living for a while in silence, he startled the world by his burning *Les paroles d'un croyant* (The Words of a Believer). In this he declares Christianity to be love and service, and the French Church to be opposed to this. In 1839 he published a pamphlet, *The Country and the Government*, and was imprisoned twelve months. In 1848 he was elected to the Constituent Assembly, but after the *coup d'état* he withdrew from public life, and died rejecting to the last all overtures of the Church. Religion to him was the source of progress; when the people had true religion in their hearts they would unite and be omnipotent.

Lassalle, Ferdinand, 1825-1864.

Born at Breslau of wealthy Jewish parentage; he studied at the Universities of Breslau and Berlin, devoting himself to philosophy. Humboldt called him "Das Wunderkind". Savigny called his *System of Acquired Rights* "the ablest legal book since the sixteenth century". At Berlin Lassalle, becoming a great favourite, in 1845 met the Countess Hatzfeldt, and for over six years defended her cause before thirty-six tribunals on a question of property. In the Revolution of 1848 he was an ardent Republican, was indicted for conspiracy and treason at Düsseldorf, and imprisoned six months. On coming out of prison Lassalle devoted himself to literary and philosophical work, living, however, completely as a man of the world. In 1854 the Hatzfeldt affair was settled, and Lassalle gave himself to the completion of his *Heraclitus*, which he published in 1858. In 1861 he brought out his *System of Acquired Rights*. He was now to enter on his more strictly Socialist career. Having lectured on Constitutional themes, Lassalle was invited to lecture, on 12th April, 1862, before an Artisans' Association in Berlin. It has been called the birthday of German Socialism. In a philosophical and historical way he traced the development of the State and of society, and argued that as the French Revolution freed the third estate, so the Revolution of '48 meant the freedom of the fourth estate. When the lecture was printed the whole edition of 3000 was seized, and Lassalle prosecuted for incendiary utterances. He defended himself, appealing to science as the excuse for his words, but was condemned to pay a fine. In 1863 he published a *brochure*, *Might and Right*, and threw himself into social agitation of every kind. He corresponded with Rodbertus (*q. v.*), but could not draw that philosopher from his books. In 1863 the Leipsic Working Man's Association was undecided whether to follow the Co-operative movement of Schulze-Delitzsch, or a more radical social policy. They asked Schulze-Delitzsch and Lassalle to appear before them and present the two views. 1300 delegates were present. Lassalle won. He argued that the working classes should be organised into productive associations, and be aided by the State. On 19th May, after forty delegates had left the hall to follow Schulze-Delitzsch, the rest voted for Lassalle. On 23rd May a German Working Man's Association was formed to carry out Lassalle's policy. It became the forerunner of the present Social Democratic Party. Lassalle now worked day and night. He spoke continually along the Rhine, and in the North. He printed 16,000 copies of an address to the working men of Berlin. During the winter of 1863-64 Lassalle's attention was divided between the Association and defending himself in the courts on repeated charges. Yet, in January, 1864, he published a volume of nearly 300 pages against Schulze-Delitzsch, in tone undignified, sometimes coarse, yet always strong. Lassalle at this time made the acquaintance of Bismarck, and seems to have influenced him to his later State Socialism. But Lassalle's main work was for the Association. In August, 1864, however, he went for a vacation to Switzerland, and found there a Fräulein von Donnegis, whom he had met previously. He fought a duel over her and was wounded, and died the night of August 30-31. He was buried, amidst the universal acclamations of the working men, in the Jewish cemetery at Breslau. The Countess Hatzfeldt was at his side when he died, and continued to aid the Association after his death. There was some division, but the Association grew till it joined the movement of the International, and thus formed the Social Democratic Party of modern Germany. See Dawson's *German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle.*

LAVELEYE, PROF. EMILE LOUIS DE, 1822-1892.

Born in Bruges. Studied at Bruges, at the Collège Stanislas in Paris, and the University of Ghent. In 1865 he became Professor of Political Economy at Liège University. In politics a Liberal, in religion a liberal Roman Catholic. He was a constant contributor to the *Revue de deux mondes*, and a voluminous writer. Among his best known books are his work on agricultural economics and on bimetallism, *e.g.*, *La Question d'or* (1860), *De la propriété et de ses formes primitives* (1874), *Socialisme contemporaine* (last edition 1893). Laveleye was so friendly to Socialism that he is often called a Socialist; he was, more strictly, a Liberal Academic Socialist.

LE PLAY, PIERRE GUILLAUME FREDERIC, 1806-

Born at La Ravière, Saint Sauveur. Deeply impressed with the sorrows of the poor around his early home, he came to Paris to study in the École Polytechnique. Graduating with honours, he started, in 1829, with Reynaud, and travelled for many years through all Europe studying social facts. In 1840 he was appointed to the Chair of Metallurgy in the School of Mines, and later was Inspector General of Mines. Coming under the notice of the Emperor, he was repeatedly appointed at the head of various scientific expeditions, particularly that of 1867. In 1855 he published his *Les ouvriers européens.* In 1856 he founded *La société internationale des etudes pratiques d'economie sociale.* In 1864 he published *La réforme sociale en France deduite de l'observation comparée des peuples européens;* in 1870, *L'organisation du travail.* In 1872 he founded *Les unions de la paix sociale*, which, in 1890, had 3000 members. In 1881 was commenced *La réforme sociale*, the organ of these unions. In its first number it declared that France, in the present century, had had eleven revolutions and nineteen successive constitutions, as the result of utter chaos in social ideas. Hence it argued the need for conclusions drawn from the patient study of facts. Le Play is often called a Liberal Christian Socialist; yet, though a Roman Catholic, he does not emphasise religion, and is as opposed to Socialism as to *laissez faire.* He simply desired truth drawn from facts, and set himself and his followers to collecting these. His remedy for social ills is a rehabilitation of the powers once vested in the father of a family and in the conductor of a workshop. The family organisation is not to be patriarchal, but what he calls the *famille souche*, with a restoration of the now limited freedom of bequest. H. Higgs has written the best English account of Le Play in the *Quart. Journal of Economics*, Boston, July, 1890.

LIEBKNECHT, WILHELM, 1826-

Born at Leipsic of poor parentage; he studied at Giessen, Berlin, and Marburg. In the Revolution of 1848 he took part in Baden, and was imprisoned from September to May. He fled to Switzerland

and then to England, where he remained till 1862. He was much with Marx, and earnestly espoused his views. In August, 1862, he returned to Germany, and edited the *North German Gazette* till it became a Bismarckian organ, when Liebknecht joined Lassalle's agitation. In 1865 he was ordered to quit Prussia. He went to Leipsic, and edited a democratic journal till it was suppressed in 1868. Returning to Berlin, he was imprisoned three months. In 1867 he was returned to the North German Diet by a Saxon constituency, and has been in the Legislature ever since. He was imprisoned in 1870, and for two years beginning in 1872. In 1881 he was expelled from Leipsic under the Socialist law. He was the leader of the International Party in Germany, won Bebel to Socialism, and with him worked for the amalgamation of the movements started by Lassalle and Marx, thus forming the Social Democratic Party, of which he and Bebel are still the main leaders. He is not an original thinker, but of high intellectual attainments, and a good writer; his *Zur Grund und Bodenfrage* (1874), a work on the land question, being among his best publications.

LUDLOW, J. M.

First mover in the Christian Socialist agitation of F. D. Maurice and Charles Kingsley; he studied Socialism and kindred movements in Paris and elsewhere, and wrote on these subjects in various papers. He is still an official of the "Labour Association" and one of the committee of the London Branch of the Christian Social Union.

MABLY, GABRIEL BONNOT DE, 1709-1785.

Born at Grenoble; studied for the Church under the Jesuits at Lyons, but became secretary to the Cardinal of Tenun, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and really himself the Minister. Having quarrelled with the cardinal, he devoted himself to economic and philosophic studies, and became a voluminous writer. His *Doutes proposés aux philosophes économistes sur l'ordre naturel des sociétés* (1768), and his *De la législation, ou principes des lois* (1770), are among his best works, and largely influenced the thinkers of the French Revolution.

MALON, BENOÎT, 1841-1893.

Born at Saint Etienne. First a labourer, and then a workman in a dye house; in 1868 he was one of the founders of the French International, and was arrested and imprisoned three months. He went to Italy, and worked there for Socialism against the Anarchists.

After the amnesty in 1880 he returned to Paris and founded the *Parti Ouvrier.* After 1882 he gave up active agitation and wrote. Among his writings are *Histoire du socialisme* (1885), *Précis historique, théorique et pratique du socialisme* (1892), and *Le socialisme intégral* (1892).

MANN, TOM, 1856-

Born at Foleshill, Warwickshire. At the age of eleven he worked in the coal mines, dragging trollies. Educating himself and working his way up, he served an apprenticeship at Birmingham as a machinist, and in 1878 went to London as an engineer. In 1884 he went for six months' work to the United States. Early showing a religious bent, he attended services of the Church of England, the Quakers, Unitarians, and Swedenborgians. Later in life he was almost induced to take orders in the Church of England. Showing his humanitarian instinct first as an advocate of teetotalism, he soon became interested in the labour movement. In 1884 he lectured on *Progress and Poverty*, and in 1885 joined the Social Democratic Federation, and later, the Fabian Society. For Socialism he worked devotedly in many ways, especially in the eight hours' movement, from 1886 to 1888, giving to the movement all his time. In 1889, as an engineer interested in the London Docks, he worked among the dockers for their organisation, and was elected President of the Dockers' Union. He was a leader in the great dock strike. He became a member of the London Trades Council, and in 1893 first secretary of the important *London Reform Union.* In 1891 he was appointed a member of the Royal Commission on Labour, and in 1894, with one other member, presented a minority Socialistic report. In 1894 he was elected secretary of the Independent Labour Party. A forcible speaker, of attractive address, and irreproachable character, he is easily one of the foremost Socialists in England. See Webb's *History of Trades Unionism*, p. 370.

MARSON, REV. C. L.

Now curate of St. Mary's, Somers Town; he has held seven curacies and lost them for his Christian Socialist ideas. He was one of the first members of the Fabian Society, and in 1884 editor of the *Christian Socialist.* He went to Australia and there founded the Australian Fabian Society. He is on the council of the Guild of St. Matthew and trustee of the Busmen's Union. He has written brilliantly on the Socialism of the Fathers (see Appendix B, § 1), also *The Psalms at Work* and *Fairy Stories*, besides contributing to *Vox Clamantium*, *The New Party*, and regularly to *Goodwill* and *The Church Reformer*, etc.

MARX, KARL, 1818-1883.

Born at Treves, of Jewish extraction; his father a lawyer. He studied at Berlin and Bonn, mainly history and philosophy, becoming an ardent Hegelian of the left wing. In 1842 he became editor of the Radical Democratic Cologne paper, the *Rhenish Gazette*. In 1843 he married the sister of the Prussian Minister Von Westfalen, and yet criticised the Government so fiercely that the same year his paper was suppressed, and Marx went to Paris to perfect his social studies. Here he met Engels, his life-long friend, and other Socialists, and among them Bakunin, Proudhon, and the poet Heine. With Arnold Ruge he edited here the *Deutsch-Französiche Jahrbücher*, and wrote minor works on Socialism. In 1845 he was expelled from Paris, and went with Engels to Brussels. Here he published his *Discours sur la libre échange* and his *Misère de la philosophie*, a criticism on Proudhon's *Philosophie de la misère*. In 1847 he visited London with Engels, and reorganised a society there, under the name of the *Communist League*. This league deputed Marx and Engels to write a *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, which they did, publishing it from Brussels early in 1848. It was soon translated into almost all European languages, and became the first formal utterance of modern Socialism. On the breaking out of the Revolution in 1848, Marx returned to Germany and published the *New Rhenish Gazette*, but it was suppressed by the Government in 1849, and Marx banished. He retired to London, where he lived till his death. During this period he wrote unceasingly, and was in constant correspondence with European Socialists. In 1859 he published his *Zur Kritik der politischen Oekonomie*. In 1869 he took part in the founding in London of the International, and soon became the real leader of the Socialist wing, as opposed to the Anarchist wing, mainly led by Bakunin. To many Socialists who do not accept the economic analysis of Marx, it is his great work for Socialism that by his energy and firmness he gave it a fixed policy, revolutionary and democratic, yet working for its aim by legitimate political methods, in opposition to the "propaganda by deed" advocated by Bakunin. At the Congress of the International at the Hague in 1872, when the Anarchists and Socialists finally separated, and the

Central Council of the International was transferred to New York City to save it from the Anarchists, it was mainly due to Marx that the separation was clearly made. In 1867 Marx published the first volume of his *Das Kapital.* (A second volume has appeared since Marx's death, with an English translation of vol. i. by Messrs. Moore and Aveling, both edited by Engels. Vol. iii. is to complete the work, though vol. i. is, to an extent, complete itself.) Marx wrote constantly for the press, being for a long time correspondent for the *New York Tribune.* He died 19th March, 1883. *Das Kapital* has been called the Bible of Socialism, mainly because Marx, more than other men, gave modern German Socialism such a definite economic basis that it called itself "Scientific Socialism". Marx starts from the position held by Adam Smith and Ricardo, that labour is the source of all value and measure of price, and from this position, by brilliant and inexorable logic, argues that capitalism is the process of taking from the labourer his surplus value, or the value he creates above that which he receives in his wages. He bitterly criticises and condemns the orthodox political economy with a wealth of learning and an acumen rarely equalled. Marx believes that social evolution is a process that cannot be changed, only aided or hindered; and argues that capitalism is surely working out its own destruction, and *must* lead to Socialism. It is this characteristic of his teaching that makes his German followers consider his Socialism not Utopian, but Scientific Socialism. Marxian Socialism is, however, by no means held by all Socialists. A growing number, especially of English Socialists, hold that while Marx's logic is not at fault, the fundamental position which he inherited from Adam Smith and Ricardo, that labour is the source of all value, is at fault, and hence his system unscientific. Nevertheless, for the brilliancy of his criticism, and especially for the firmness with which he impressed his policy of a law-abiding revolution, upon the Socialism of to-day, all Socialists consider Marx in a large sense their leader. See Dawson's *German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle.*

MAURICE, REV. J. FREDERICK DENISON, 1805-1872.

Born at Normanstone; son of a Unitarian clergyman. In 1823 Maurice entered Trinity, Cambridge. From 1827-1829 he edited the *Athenæum.* Changing his views he entered the Church of England, and went to Oxford and obtained a second class in classics, 1831. He was ordained curate at Bubbenhall in 1834. In 1835 he wrote *Subscription no Bondage* and *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, gaining wide attention for his bold Church thought. In 1836 he was made chaplain of Guy's Hospital, and was thenceforward identified with London life. He now published many books, notably his *Kingdom of Christ.* He became Professor of English Literature, and in 1846, of Divinity, at King's College. In 1853, however, he published his *Theological Essays*, and was deprived of his chair because of his broad views. He was chaplain of Lincoln's Inn (1846-60), and incumbent of St. Peter's, Vere Street (1860-69). In 1846 his attention was called to social matters by Ludlow; and in 1848, with Kingsley and others, founded the Christian Socialist movement, he himself choosing the name, and being the intellectual "master" of the movement, and one of the chief contributors to its literature. He later was a chief mover in establishing the Working Men's College, and Queen's College for Women. In 1866 Maurice was appointed Professor of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge. A voluminous writer; he is the intellectual father of the social movement in the English Church, with his at once broad theology and high conception of the Church.

MAZZINI, GUISEPPE, 1805-1872.

Born in Genoa, 22nd June. His father a leading physician; he was educated in law at the university, graduating in 1826. He worked for some time in the *Ufficio dei Poveri.* His first efforts were literary, but he became an ardent Republican and joined the *Carbonari*, and in 1830 was betrayed and apprehended in Piedmont. After six months' imprisonment he was liberated and fled to Marseilles. Here he founded the society "The Young Italy," whose mottoes were "God and the People," "Unity, Independence, Liberty, Equality, and Humanity". He issued a manifesto, and commenced active agitation. He planned a revolutionary expedition into Savoy, but was defeated. Going to Switzerland he organised the society "The New Europe". In 1837 he went to England, and took up his abode in London. Here, after a fight with poverty, he gained command of the language, and wrote many brilliant magazine articles in the *Westminster Review.* He was involved in a conflict with the Home Secretary, who opened Mazzini's letters. He was in correspondence with all the Italian, and many European, Republican conspirators. In 1848 he went to Italy and took arms under Garibaldi. In 1849 he was made a member of the short-lived provisional government of Tuscany, and of the Constituent Assembly at Rome. Later, Mazzini was appointed a triumvir, with supreme executive power. He won golden laurels, but finally advised the surrender of Rome, and went to Switzerland. He instigated uprisings at Milan (1853), Piedmont (1857), and Sicily (1860). In 1864 he was expelled from Switzerland, and returned to England. In 1870 he went again to Sicily, but was arrested at sea and imprisoned two months. Returning to London, he went again to Italy, and died at Pisa, 10th March, 1872. His most famous books are *Duties of Man*, addressed to working men, and *Thoughts upon Democracy in Europe*. Mazzini opposed both Socialism (the International) and Christianity as they were presented to him, but his writings are full of the best Christian Socialism. He puts more emphasis upon duties than upon rights, and pleads for unity, through sacrifice. His essays are among the very greatest of social writings.

MILL, JOHN STUART, 1806-1873.

Son of the Benthamite philosopher, James Mill. Educated by his father, he showed phenomenal precociousness, though subjected to the strictest mental discipline. In 1832 he became a clerk in the India House. A frequent contributor to the *London and Westminster Review*, and the *Edinburgh Review*. In 1843 he published his *Logic* in two volumes; in 1844, his essays on *Some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy*; and in 1848, his *Principles of Political Economy, with some of their Applications to Social Philosophy*, an epoch-making book. In it political economy is no longer "the dismal science" of cold theory, but the practical study how to cure economic evils; though on the whole of the orthodox school, it is, nevertheless, progressive. In 1859 he published his *Liberty*, and also *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform*; his *Representative Government* appeared in 1860, and *Utilitarianism* in 1861. His *Subjection of Women* was Mill's next work, though not published till 1869. In 1865 appeared his *Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy*. The same year he was elected to Parliament for Westminster, though he refused to make any canvass for the office. His Parliamentary career, however, was short and not marked. His subscription to the election expenses of Mr. Bradlaugh, and other independent acts, cost him his seat in 1868, and he retired to literary life at Avignon. Here he wrote many articles and essays, and for his last public work was engaged in the starting of the Land Tenure Reform Association. In 1851 he had married, and for twenty years had lived with his wife in the closest intellectual sympathy; after the death of his wife, his step-daughter, Miss Taylor, became his constant companion. His *Autobiography* appeared in 1873, and created great interest; and in it Mill relates, step by step, his conversion to a position when he could say of himself and his wife, "Our ideal of ultimate improvement went far beyond Democracy, and would class us decidedly under the general name of Socialists. . . . The Social problem of the future we considered to be, how to unite the greatest liberty of action with a common ownership in the raw material of the globe, and an equal participation of all the benefits of combined labour."—(See *Autobiography*, 1873.)

MORE, SIR THOMAS, 1480-1535.

Son of a judge of the King's Bench. In 1497 he entered Oxford, and later studied law at Lincoln's Inn, London, and in 1502 became a judge in the sheriffs' court. In 1516 he wrote his *Utopia*, printed in Louvain, under the editorship of Erasmus. In 1521 he was made Treasurer of the Exchequer, and Speaker of the House in 1523. In 1529 he was made Lord Chancellor in place of Cardinal Wolsey; but resigned in 1532, because his conscience would not let him sanction the divorce of Catherine. Having declined to take the oath by which he was required to recognise the validity of the marriage of Anne Boleyn, he was consigned to the Tower in 1534, and was beheaded 6th July, 1535, on the charge of treason, because he denied the King's supremacy as head of the Church. His *Utopia* is a Socialistic republic, modelled somewhat after Plato's, and yet with much originality. He pictures a six hours' working-day, and calls government "a conspiracy of the rich" to oppress the poor.

MORGAN, THOMAS JOHN, 1848-

Born in Birmingham, England. Educated in factory and evening schools. He went to Chicago in 1869; he soon joined the Machinists' Union, the Sovereigns of Industry in 1873, and the Socialists in 1875, and soon became the leading Socialist in Chicago. He was their candidate for Mayor in 1891.

MORRIS, WILLIAM, 1834-

Born at Walthamstow; educated at Marlborough, and Exeter College, Oxford. In 1856 he was articled to Mr. Street, the architect, and commenced contributing to several papers, mainly the *Oxford and Cambridge Magazine*. In 1858 he published *The Defence of Guenevère and other Poems*; in 1867, *The Life and Death of Jason*, a heroic poem in seventeen books. In 1868 came out the first instalment of *The Earthly Paradise.* Meanwhile he had established the fine art decorative works now so intimately connected with his name. In 1876 appeared his Virgil's *Æneid* done into English verse, and in 1878 *The Story of Sigurd, the Volsung, and the Fall of the Niblungs*, by many considered his masterpiece. Up to this time he had been, as he called himself, "the idle singer of an empty day". His experience in the commercialism and consequent degradation of modern art now drove him to Socialism. In 1885 he was instrumental in forming the Socialist League, and since that has worked strenuously for Socialism, editing and writing for the *Commonweal*, attending meetings, and addressing open-air audiences of working men. He has published numerous Socialist lectures, tracts, and chants, such as *Art and Socialism* (1884), *Signs of Change*, *Useful Work versus Useless Toil*, etc., etc. His later poems are Homer's *Odyssey*, done into English verse (1887), *A Tale of the House of Wolfings* (1889). In 1888 he republished from the *Commonweal*, *A Dream of John Ball*, a most beautiful Socialist prose poem; in 1892, *News from Nowhere*, a Socialistic and artistic Utopia, and in 1894, in conjunction with Belfort Bax, *Socialism, its Growth and Outcome.* Although he has retired from the editorship of the *Commonweal*, which has passed into Anarchist hands, Mr. Morris still works most fruitfully as "Poet, Artist, and Socialist".

MORRIS, REV. W. A.

Vicar of St. Anne's, South Lambeth, called "Brother Bob" by the gas workers; he left Oxford to found a social and Socialist club in Vauxhall. This club was the centre of the South London gas strike; and in Mr. Morris's room the now famous May Day Demonstration originated.

MOST, JOHANN JOSEPH, 1846-

Born at Augsburg; he, at Berlin, early developed into a leader of the most violent and Anarchistic wing of German Socialism in connection with the International, till he was driven out of their organisation by the Socialists. Expelled from Berlin in 1878, he went to London, and there, in 1879, founded his *Freiheit*, an organ of Anarchist Communism. In 1881 he was condemned to sixteen months' hard labour for his incendiary utterances concerning the assassination of the Czar. In 1882 he emigrated to New York, and has since published his paper from that city. He has been imprisoned more than once, but still remains the leading Anarchist Communist in the United States. Among his main writings are *Die Lösung der sociale Frage* (Berlin, 1876), *Die Anarchie* (New York, 1888), *Social Monster* (1890).

MUN, COMTE ADRIEN ALBERT MARIE DE, 1841-

A captain of French Cuirassiers; he resigned his position in 1875 to devote himself to Roman Catholic Christian Socialism. With others he founded *L'Oeuvre des Circles Ouvriers.* Taking his position on the Absolutism of the Church, even that of the Syllabus, he strives for the Contre Revolution. He believes in an increase of State activities; but would have State, labour, and all life under the paternal guidance of the Church, and to this end concentrates all his efforts, both in organising Church unions among working men, and in politics. He has twice conducted large bodies of working men to Rome to receive the papal blessing. An eloquent and fiery speaker, and with an attractive address, he has been frequently elected deputy. He calls himself politically, of late, not a Christian Socialist, but a " Conservateur Rallié ".

NIEUWENHUIS, FERDINAND DOMELA, 1846-

The most prominent Communistic Socialist in Holland. Born at Amsterdam; educated for the ministry at Luther College, he became a clergyman in Harlingen, 1870, Beveruyk, 1871, and in 1875 at the Hague. Here he became a celebrated preacher; but in 1879 he left the Church, feeling that it did not fulfil his mission, and was on the side of the rich against the poor. Henceforth he has devoted himself to the Socialist propaganda, being for long the head and front of the movement in Holland. In 1879 he founded the *Recht voor Allen*, the main Dutch Socialist weekly. From 1888 to 1891 he was a member of Parliament, a position he cared for at the last very little, believing that the Government was so completely in the hands of the capitalists that for Socialists to attempt to work through it was worse than useless. The feeling has grown upon him till, to-day, he utterly opposes the participation of Socialists in politics; and he has become, therefore, opposed by the majority of the Dutch Socialists, who, like the Socialists of all countries, do believe in political action. The Socialists often call Nieuwenhuis an Anarchist, though he calls himself a Communist. His ability and radical utterances still make him popular among the masses, for whom, although of some means of his own, he has sacrificed prospects, money, and reputation. He has published numerous books and pamphlets, among which are *My Farewell to the Church*, *The Labour Day*, *Capital and Labour*, *The Book of the Kings*, *The Life of Jesus*, *The Bible*, *Essays on the French Revolution.*

OASTLER, RICHARD, 1789-1861.

Born in Huddersfield, Yorkshire; he succeeded his father as steward to Mr. Thornhill. Early interested in the abolition of slavery, he suddenly discovered that there was factory and wage slavery in England. In a controversy in the *Leeds Mercury* he proved that there was slavery in England, and aroused an intense excitement. He began to agitate for factory legislation, and a Bill was introduced in Parliament, but defeated. Calumny was heaped upon him, and all the factory reformers. Oastler's motto was, "Ten hours a day and a time-book". Mr. Sadler, M.P., co-operated with him, yet in vain. Finally, Lord Ashley, afterwards Earl of Shaftesbury, took up his cause; and on 17th June, 1833, a compromise Bill was introduced, and finally carried. It was, however, openly disobeyed; and Oastler continued his agitation, till in the midst of it advantage was taken of a small bill unpaid, and Oastler cast into prison. Even from Fleet Prison he issued weekly his Fleet papers on the subject of reform. After four years in prison, his friends raised the money and procured his release. In 1847 he saw the passage of the Ten Hours Bill. Henceforth in poverty, but in quiet, the great "Factory King" lived till his death in 1861.

OWEN, ROBERT, 1771-1858.

Sometimes called the Father of Socialism. Born at Newtown, North Wales. At the age of ten he served in a shop at Stamford, then at London and Manchester. At the age of nineteen he managed a mill, and became the chief cotton spinner in England. During a visit to Glasgow he fell in love with a daughter of Mr. Dale, the proprietor of the mills at New Lanark, and in 1800 he married her, and became manager and part owner of the mills. 2000 people were employed here, 500 of them children. Theft, drunkenness, and vice prevailed; most families lived in one room. He checked child labour, provided good dwellings, introduced amusements, and promoted education. He was the founder of infant schools in England. In 1813 he formed a new firm, Jeremy Bentham and the Quaker William Allen among them; men who, content with five per cent. profit, were willing to devote their other gains to charities and reforms. The same year he began to publish his successful attempts to the world, writing the first of four essays on *A New View of Society; or, Essays on the Principle of the Formation of Human Character.* He began now to correspond with the legislators of all countries, and was a zealous worker for the factory law of 1819. In 1817 he laid before Parliament a plan for Socialistic communities to be provided by the State for paupers, where work should be in common. By many this is considered the birth of modern Socialism. It was favourably received by the country; but Owen by his defiance of religious ideas soon began to lose the friends he had made. In 1825, however, his disciple, Arthur Combe, attempted a community at Orbiston, near Glasgow; and the same year Owen himself commenced his famous experiment at New Harmony, in Indiana, U.S. After a trial of two years both failed, that in Indiana through dissensions as to management. Various forms of government were tried, Owen himself at one time taking the management; but there was no unity, and the attempt failed. Owen resigned his connection with it in 1828. Returning to London, he carried on a propaganda for Socialism and Secularism, with lax ideas on marriage. He attempted other communities in Ireland and elsewhere, and, in 1835, he formed an association of all classes of all nations. It was in the discussion that grew out of this that the words Socialism and Socialists were first used. In his latter years Owen became utterly visionary in his social ideas, and in religion a spiritualist. He died in his native town, aged 87. His fundamental principle was that man is the product of environment. The notion that men form their own character he called "the enemy of humanity, the hydra of human calamity". He was historically without doubt the founder of Socialism in England, and from 1830 to 1835 had a very large following among the English trades unionists and others, as may be seen by the Owenist press of the time, the *Crisis*, the *Pioneer*, and the *Herald of the Rights of Man.* He was the chief mover in "The Grand National Consolidated Trades Union," which grew with mushroom rapidity, within a few weeks in 1834 gaining half a million members. His Socialism was utopian; and modern evolutionary Socialism is not to be confounded with it. An autobiography appeared in 1857; a life in 1872, by Lloyd Jones (new edition, 1895).

PEASE, EDWARD R., 1857-

Born at Bristol, England, of Quaker parentage. Educated with private tutors, he became a stockbroker in London. Coming to hold Socialist views, he gave up brokerage to become a cabinet maker. It was at a meeting in his rooms in 1883 that the Fabian Society was formed, and in 1886 he became its secretary. Resigning, however, he went to the United States in 1888, but failing to find work, returned to England and engaged in labour organisation. In 1890 he again became Secretary of the Fabian Society, a position he still holds, and to which he gives all his time. He and his clever wife are also earnest members of the Society of the Friends of Russian Freedom.

PERIN, CHARLES.

Professor of Political Economy and Law in the University of Louvain, Belgium. In 1861 he published his *De la richesse dans les sociétés chrétiennes*, in 1875 his *Les lois de la société chrétienne*, with an address appended which he delivered before the Congress of the Directors of the Roman Catholic Workmen's Association at Chartres, 9th August, 1878. In 1880 he published his *Les Doctrines économiques depuis un siècle.* He is perhaps the leading Roman Catholic Christian Socialist writer, and has made Louvain a centre for this school, which favours State action and working men's organisation under the guidance of the Roman Church.

PHILLIPS, WENDELL, 1811-1884.

Born in Boston, Mass., of an aristocratic family; educated at Harvard College; called to the bar in 1834. In 1837 he joined the Abolition movement. In 1839 he relinquished his profession because he could no longer abide by his oath of fidelity to the United States Constitution, following the Garrisonian Abolitionists, who believed the Constitution to be an immoral compromise with slavery. He now gave all his interest to the Abolition movement, his speeches being classics of American eloquence. After the Civil War Phillips became, in Garrison's place, President of the Anti-Slavery Society, and succeeded in winning for the blacks full citizenship. Phillips now took up the labour movement in earnest, and in 1870 was the candidate of the Labour Reform Party for Governor of Massachusetts. His later speeches are full of invective against unjust wealth, and of exhortations to working men to stand for their rights.

PLATO, 427 B.C.-345 B.C.

Educated in Athens, he became the devoted pupil and friend of Socrates. After Socrates' death, driven from Athens, Plato visited

Sicily, and (probably) Italy and Africa. Returning to Athens about 387 B.C., he founded the great philosophic school of the Academy, and taught here amidst a brilliant following, including Aristotle, for forty-two years. His main economic works are the *Republic* and the *Laws*. In these the subordination of the individual to the State takes its most extreme form. In his *Republic*, amidst the citizens of the highest class, he advocates community of wives and of property. The limits of the territory and of the population he would have strictly regulated. He would prohibit early marriages and expose children. The working classes he despises, and the lowest forms of labour he assigns to foreigners and slaves. All economic dealings he would have strictly controlled by the State. In his *Laws* he somewhat modifies his views, and describes the communism he thinks practicable, though far less thorough-going than his ideal. He would limit private property, and have the State control though not own all. See Ingram's *History of Political Economy*, and Cossa's *Introduction to Political Economy*.

PROUDHON, PIERRE JOSEPH, 1809-1865.

Born at Besançon, France, the native place of Fourier. His father was a brewer's cooper, and he commenced life by herding cows. He entered the college of his native town, but had to borrow his books. There is a story of his returning home laden with prizes, but to find no dinner. In 1828 he became a compositor, then a corrector for the press, learning Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, as well as French. In 1838 he obtained the *Pension Suard*, a scholarship of 1500 francs for three years. In 1839 he published his treatise *On the Utility of Keeping Sunday*, which contains the germ of his revolutionary ideas. He went to Paris, and in 1840 published his *What is Property?* (*Qu'est que la propriété?*) with his famous answer, *La Propriété c'est le vol* (*Property is Theft*). Creating great hostility, he was tried at Besançon, but acquitted. In 1846 he published his greatest work, the *Système des contradictions économiques, ou philosophie de la misère*. He carried on a small printing establishment at Besançon, but without success, and relinquished it to find a position in a commercial firm in Lyons. In 1847 he returned to Paris, and threw himself into the Revolution of 1848. He was the moving spirit of the *Représentant du Peuple*, and other journals, and as a member of the Assembly for the Seine he advocated the extremest measures. His attempt to found a bank failed, and his utterances became so violent that he was imprisoned in Paris for three years, during which he married a young working woman. As his aims were for economic rather than political reform, he lived in quiet under the Second Empire, till he wrote his *De la justice dans la révolution et dans l'eglise* (1858), in which he attacked Church and State with unusual fury, and had to flee to Brussels. On his return to France his health broke down, and he died at Passy, 1865. He was a Puritan in his life, and opposed to the Socialism of his day for its utopian and immoral character. His writings are often inconsistent, but aim ever at justice, liberty, and equality. Service, he taught, should balance service. He did not believe that Society could be saved by Socialistic schemes off-hand. For property he would establish the right of occupation equally for all men. He is considered the father of philosophical Anarchism, although its tenets as now held, developed by Warren, Stirner, Tucker, and others, are found in Proudhon only in the germ. Cossa says he late in life abandoned Anarchism for Federalism. His *Property* and his *System of Economical Contradiction* have been translated by B. R. Tucker.

QUELCH, HENRY, 1858-

Born in Berkshire; he became a blacksmith, but in 1872 came to London, and soon interested himself in social reform. In 1881 he joined the Social Democratic Federation (almost from its start), and in 1884 commenced writing for *Justice*, since 1892 giving it all his time, and becoming its responsible editor. In 1889 he was elected Secretary of the Southside Labour Protection League, of which he is still a member. He has been sent to three Trades Union Congresses and International Socialist Congresses, at Roubaix (1887), Brussels (1891), and Zurich (1894). In 1891 he was arrested for his utterances, but acquitted.

RECLUS, JACQUES ELISÉE, 1830-

Born at Saint Foy le Grand; studied in Rhenish Prussia, and at Berlin. Coming to Paris, his extreme Republican views caused him to leave the country after the *coup d'état* of 28th December, 1851. Till 1857 he travelled in England, Ireland, the United States, and New Granada, and in 1857 returned to Paris and published his geographical researches. He wrote various scientific works, and also contributed to Anarchist journals. Taking part with the Communists of Paris, he was made prisoner in 1871, and sentenced to transportation for life, a sentence afterwards changed to one of banishment. Going to Switzerland, he was admitted to the benefits of amnesty in 1879. In 1882 he initiated the anti-marriage movement, marrying his two daughters without religious or civil ceremony. His main Anarchist writings are *Anarchy by an Anarchist* (1884), and *Evolution and Revolution* (1891). In 1878 he wrote to a Congress of Anarchists at Freiburg: "We are revolutionaries because we desire justice. . . . Progress has never resulted from mere peaceful evolution. . . . We are Anarchists who recognise no one as our master. . . . There is no such thing as morality without liberty. . . . We are also International Collectivists, for we are aware that the very existence of human beings necessarily implies a certain social grouping." See *The Anarchist Peril*, by Félix Dubois, translated by Ralph Derechef.

REYBAUD, MARIE ROCHE LOUIS, 1799-1879.

Born in Marseilles, he went to Paris in 1829, and became the leading historian of the Socialistic school. A novelist as well as an historian, in 1850 he was elected a member of the Academy. His *Études sur les réformateurs ou socialistes modernes* (2 vols., 1840-43) was the first work to bring the word *socialism* into general use.

RODBERTUS, KARL JOHANN, 1805-1875.

Born in Greifswald; his father a professor. He was educated at Berlin, Göttingen, and Heidelberg. After practising law, and travelling, he bought, in 1836, the estate of Jagetzow in Pomerania. Here he devoted himself to economic and other studies, and became prominent in Prussian politics. In June, 1848, he was for a fortnight Cabinet Minister for Public Worship and Education. He was elected in 1849 once for the First Chamber, and twice for the Second. Defeated as a candidate for the first North German Diet, he retired from politics, and Lassalle could not induce him to combine his Socialism with a political agitation. His first great work, published in 1842, *Zur Erkenntniss unserer staats-wirthschaftlichen Zustände*, outlines his position. He was a Ricardian, and from this position, before Marx, deduced Socialistic economics. Many modern economists call him a greater Socialist economist than Marx. He died on his estates, 8th December. See Dawson's *German Socialists and Ferdinand Lassalle.*

ROUSSEAU, JEAN JACQUES, 1712-1778.

Born in Geneva of French parentage. Early left by his dissipated father to care for himself, he followed a wandering sentimental life, serving various ladies of rank as footman, and sometimes as lover. He made his living in part by copying music. Married at one time, he consigned his five children to the foundling hospital. In 1749 he won a prize from the Academy of Dijon, by an essay advocating the superiority of the savage state, and this made him famous. Winning honours and court patronage, which, in part, he disdained, his *La Nouvelle Héloise* appeared in 1760. In 1762 he produced *Le Contrat Social* at Amsterdam. Attacked by his enemies, he fled from France and was welcomed by Frederick II. Finally he went to Switzerland till banished from there; he went to England in 1766, welcomed by Hume and others. In 1767 he returned to Paris, but only for a little while, wandering here and there till 1770, when he returned to Paris and took up his old profession of copying music. He also published his *Confessions* and other lesser work. He died 2nd July, probably of apoplexy. His famous theory of a state of nature, of material rights, and of government as receiving all its rights from the consent of the governed, though not peculiar to him, he so brilliantly stated as to have influenced the whole political life of his day, and so led the way to the French Revolution and the modern movement.

RUSKIN, JOHN, 1819-

Born in London, educated at home and at Christ Church, Oxford. Studying painting, he wrote a pamphlet in defence of Turner, since enlarged into *Modern Painters*, the first volume of which appeared in 1843. It made him famous at once, the second volume of *Modern Painters* appearing in 1846, after a residence in Italy. In 1851 and 1853 appeared *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* and *The Stones of Venice*. In 1867 he was elected Slade Professor of Fine Arts at Oxford. He resigned this in 1884, and has since lived in retirement at Brantwood. He has written much on economic questions, brilliantly criticising the orthodox political economy, and evolving one peculiarly his own, mainly in *The Crown of Wild Olives* (1866), *Unto This Last* (1862), *Munera Pulveris* (1872), and *Fors Clavigera*, or a collection of letters to working-men. In May, 1871, Mr. Ruskin proposed in one of these letters a St. George's Guild, which was to have an agricultural, industrial, and artistic character. It was to form a community for joyous agricultural and other manual work. Several acres of land were actually bought, but the plan came to little. More practical were Ruskin's efforts at fostering village industries, especially the bringing back of the spinning-wheel industry, under Albert Fleming's guidance, in Westmoreland. The essence of Ruskin's economic teachings may be put in one of his own phrases, "There is no wealth but life; life, including all its powers of love, of joy, and of admiration". Property, he held, should belong "to whom proper".

SAINT-SIMON, COUNT HENRY ROUVROY DE, 1760-1825.

Born at Paris of noble family, at the age of sixteen he entered the army, and in 1779 went to America and fought under Washington. Returning to Europe, he pushed projects for canals across Panama and in Spain. The Revolution coming, he sided with the people, and was made president of his commune. He renounced his title of Count, but was, nevertheless, imprisoned as an aristocrat till the Themidor Revolution. Acquiring money by speculation, he commenced to study science, and in order to get knowledge of life plunged deliberately into dissipation. With money gone and health broken, he became a copying clerk on $200 a year. Not till 1809 did he venture to write *Sur la science de l'homme* and *Sur la gravitation universelle*, and begged publishers to take them to keep him from starvation. In 1817, in a treatise entitled *L'Industrie*, he began to publish his Socialistic views, which he developed in *L'Organisateur* (1819), *Du système industriel* (1821), and *Catechisme des industriels* (1823). The last and best expression of his views was in his *Nouveau Christianisme* (1825). In 1823 he attempted suicide. Only late in his career did he attract followers, and he died in 1825 in poverty. His aim was an industrial state, directed by modern science. He appealed both to Louis XVIII. and to the Pope to institute it. The final end of social activity was to be "the exploitation of the globe by association". In his *Nouveau Christianisme* he propounds as the comprehensive formula of his new Christianity, that "the whole of society ought to strive towards the amelioration of the moral and physical existence of the poorest class; society ought to organise itself in the best way adapted for attaining this end". In this religious departure he finally broke with Comte. In 1828 Bayard gave a course of lectures on the Saint-Simonian faith. In 1830, with Bayard and Enfantin at its head, the school became famous. In 1831 the school got possessed of the *Globe* through Pierre Leroux, and many of the best pupils of the École Polytechnique caught its enthusiasm. The members of the school lived in common on the

Rue Monsigny. Dissensions, however, arose, and though the school removed to Menilmontant, and attempted a communism on some property of Enfantin, it came to an end in 1832; many of its followers, however, becoming famous as engineers. The idea of the Suez Canal, as carried out by Lesseps, proceeded from the school of Saint-Simon. The Saint-Simonians have been accused of teaching immoralities; but they believed in marriage, only in the equality of women with men. They believed in the community of goods, but not in equality, but in the "natural inequality" of man.

SCHÄFFLE, ALBRECHT EBERHARDT FRIEDRICH, 1831-

In 1861 professor at Tübingen; from 1862 to 1865 a member of the Würtemberg *Landtag*, and in 1868 of the *Zollparliament.* In 1868 professor at Vienna. From 1870 to 1871 Austrian Minister of Commerce in the Hohenwalt Cabinet. Now lives at Stuttgart, editor of the quarterly *Zeitschrift für die gesammte Staatwissenschaft.* He has written of Socialism so fairly in many ways in his *Quintessence of Socialism* that many have called him its defender, to which he answered by his *Impossibility of Social Democracy.* He is, however, a representative State Socialist, or Socialist of the Chair, and believes in much State activity and control. His main works are: *Die National Ekonomie* (1861), *Bau und Leben des sozialen Körpers* (4 vols., 1875-78), *Kapitalismus und Socialismus* (1870), *Die Quintessenz des Socialismus* (1875, thirteenth edition, 1891, translated into English), *Die Aussichtlosigkeit der Sozial Demokratie* (1885, translated under the title of *The Impossibilty of Social Democracy*), *The Theory and Policy of Labour Protection* (1893).

SCHMOLLER, GUSTAVE, 1838.

Perhaps the leading German Socialist of the Chair. He delivered the opening address at the Eisenach Congress (see chapter xiii.), and since 1881 has been the editor of the important *Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung Verwaltung und Volkswirthschaft.* He is now Professor at Berlin. He has written numberless works on small industries, corporations, etc. His best known works are: *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Kleingewerbe in* 19 *Jahrhundeet* (1870), *Ueber einige Grundfragen des Rechts und der Volkswirthschaft* (1875), *Die geschichtliche entwicklung der Unternehmung* (1890-93), and *Zur social und Gewerbepolitik der Gegenwart* (1890).

SHAW, G. BERNARD, 1856-

Of Irish blood, Mr. Shaw is a brilliant young English journalist and dramatic critic to the London *Saturday Review.* Socialism, however, he introduces under all guises. He is the author of two of the Fabian essays, and several Fabian tracts. He has written the *Quintessence of Ibsenism* (1891), and *Widowers' Houses*, a (Socialist) comedy (1893), with many shorter *brochures.*

SHUTTLEWORTH, PROF. H. C.

Formerly minor canon of St. Paul's, now rector of St. Nicholas Cole Abbey, and professor of Pastoral Theology at King's College. Author of *The Place of Music in Public Worship.* He finds in Catholic theology both Christian Socialism and the basis of his musical art.

SPARLING, H. HALLIDAY, 1860-

Educated principally in Connemara; he became a Socialist in 1880, member of the Socialist League in 1884, and co-editor with Wm. Morris of the *Commonweal*, as long as it was a Socialist paper. He married May Morris, and now devotes himself mainly to historical study and writing on Socialism.

STEAD, WILLIAM THOMAS, 1849-

Born at Embleton, Northumberland. Educated at home and at Wakefield, but left school at fourteen. In 1871 he became editor of the *Northern Echo;* in 1880 assistant editor, and in 1883 editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette;* in 1890 he founded the *Review of Reviews.* In 1885 he published the *Tribute of Modern Babylon*, an exposure of crimes in London against women and children, which produced a sensation, and led to the passage of the Criminal Law Amendment Act. He was accused, tried, and sentenced to six months' imprisonment, having unwittingly disobeyed the law in giving his evidence. In 1866 he visited Ireland and published his *No Reduction no Rent;* in 1888 he visited Russia and published his *Truth about Russia;* in 1889 he interviewed the Pope for the *New Era*, and wrote on the Roman question; in 1893 he went to Chicago, and exposed the civil and social corruption of that city in his *If Christ came to Chicago.* Mr. Stead has commenced a movement for what he calls the *Civic Church*, all churches and ethical forces to combine on a territorial basis to reform society. To the State he gives a large programme. He is thus to a large degree a Christian Socialist.

Stöcker, Adolf, 1835-

Born in Halberstadt, Germany. Chaplain in Metz, 1871; Court preacher in Berlin from 1877. The same year he started a so-called Christian Socialist movement against the Social Democrats. He is better known as a leader of the Anti-Semitic movement. Member of the Reichstag in 1881. Published *Christlich Soziale: reden und aufsätze* (1890).

Swift, Morrison J., 1856-

Born at Ravenna, Ohio, U.S.A.; studied in Western Reserve College. A.B. from Williams College; studied further at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, and at Berlin University. Taught philosophy and political economy one year at Hobart College, Geneva, New York. Studied the life and social conditions of the poor in New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and in various cities in Europe. In San Francisco he made some progress towards establishing a Social University. In 1893 he went to Boston, Mass., and became the leader of the strong agitation there of the unemployed. He also conducted the Boston army of the unemployed to Washington. Mr. Swift has done much speaking, and written many radical pamphlets, such as *A Social University*, *The Social Ordeal of Christianity*, *Is it Right to Rob Robbers?* etc., etc. He describes his views in brief as those of Anarchist Socialism.

Swinton, John, 1830-

Born in Illinois, he became a printer, but studied law and medicine. Coming to New York about 1850, he was, in 1860 and through the war of the Rebellion, chief editor of the *Times*. Later he worked on the *Tribune* with Horace Greeley, and from 1879 to 1883 was chief editor of the *Sun*, which position he resigned to start *John Swinton's Journal*, one of the best American labour papers. He was nominated for mayor of New York by the working men in 1874, but polled only a few votes. He was active in all labour movements, but had to suspend his paper in 1886, since when he has lived in retirement, though still occasionally speaking and writing in the cause of labour.

Thünen, Johann Heinrich von, 1783-1850.

The son of a landed proprietor, he became himself the owner of a large estate near Rostock. Political economy became his favourite study, and in 1826 he published the first volume of his *Der Isoliete Staat.* It is still a matter of debate how far Von Thünen was a Socialist, but many of the opinions to which he gives expression are of a decidedly advanced nature. Von Thünen's inquiries led him to the conclusion that the wages of a labourer only cover the cost of his maintenance, and the interest on the capital employed in his bringing up: for his labour, his exertion, he receives nothing but his life, *i.e.*, his necessary subsistence. Von Thünen thinks that the only way to raise the wages of labour is to increase the cost of bringing up the labourer, and thus he advocates the better education and training of the workman's children, the requisite cost being regarded as an indispensable need.

TILLETT, BEN, 1860-

Born in Bristol, England, he worked in coal pits and brick yards till he was fourteen, when he went to sea in the merchant service. Returning to London, 1877, he found work as a tea cooper. He organised the tea coopers, and later became secretary of the Dockers' Union, and was the first mover in the great and successful dock strike of 1889, which made an epoch in English Trades Unionism. He is now secretary of the Dock, Wharf, and Riverside Labourers' Union; a leader in the New Unionism.

TOLSTOI, COUNT LYOF NIKOLAIEVITCH, 1829-

Born September 9 at Iasnaïa Polrana. Educated as a noble; entered the army when twenty-three. Five years later he resigned, and devoted himself to literature. His *War and Peace*, regarded by the Russians as his masterpiece, appeared in 1860; *Anna Karenina* in 1876. Suddenly there came a change. In *Vanity*, *My Confession*, and *What to Do*, appearing in 1885, and other similar books, he treats of social problems and the suffering of the poor; he is merciless on the present pseudo-Christian civilisation, and advocates the literal following of the commands of Christ, which he sums up in five points: (1) Live in peace with all men, and never justify anger; (2) Guard against libertinism; (3) Never take an oath, or bind yourself with any promise; (4) Never resist evil with force; (5) Love your enemies. In 1890 he published his strange *Kreutzer Sonata*, in which he seems to consider celibacy the highest sexual virtue. Tolstoi has made his estates over to his wife, and lives on them in the simplest way, doing manual work, writing, and aiding the peasants. He seems to believe neither in government nor civil organisation of any kind, since they involve, according to him, oaths or promises. He may be best described as a Christian Anarchist, who condemns the use of force.

TREVOR, JOHN, 1855-

Born in Liverpool; his father (a linen draper) died when he was four, his mother when he was nine. Educated by friends at a harsh boarding-school, he was brought up in Evangelical Puritanism. Studying architecture at Norwich, he was much alone brooding over religious questions. At twenty-two a nervous break-down sent him to Australia. After four months here he went to the United States for fourteen months, and entered Meadville Theological Seminary (Unitarian). Returning to London, he was offered a pulpit, but felt he had nothing to preach, and practised architecture in the south of England, where he married. For three years he lived in retirement, and then felt "a call" to preach, and became assistant to Rev. Philip Wicksted, in Little Portland Street Chapel. In 1890 he went to Upper Brook Street Free Church, Manchester. His second sermon here was on "Sweating". From this time he went on, till he felt again called to leave "respectable" churches, and preach the religious nature of the Labour movement. Gathering around him the poor, he hired an old music hall, and commenced a Labour Church. His message was as follows:—"The message of the Labour Church is that without obedience to God's laws there can be no liberty. The Gospel of the Labour Church is that God is in the Labour Movement, working through it for the further emancipation of man from the tyranny both of his own half-developed nature and of those social conditions which are opposed to his higher development. The call of the Labour Church is to men everywhere to become God's 'fellow-workers' in the era of reconstruction on which we have entered." The movement created a large following. He started a paper, *The Labour Prophet*, and in town after town started labour churches, from Aberdeen to Plymouth. Of the permanent results it is too soon to speak. Trevor has written many tracts: *Theology and the Slums*, *Man's Cry for God*, etc. His views are more those of an etherealised secularism than of what most men call religion.

VAILLANT, MARIE EDOUARD, 1840-

Born at Vierzon. Student of the *Ecole Centrale des Arts et Manufactures*. Civil engineer, 1862. Physician and surgeon. He was a member of the Commune in 1871, and prominent as a Blanquist Socialist ever since; elected to the Municipal Council of Paris in 1884, and as a deputy in 1893.

VERINDER, FRED, 1858-

Born in Bethnal Green. Studied science. He was one o the founders and has been the first and only secretary of the Guild of St. Matthew. He is sub-editor of the *Church Reformer*, secretary of the English Land Restoration League, organiser of the Red Van Movement, and contributor to various Socialist papers.

VIVÎS, LUDOVICO.

A Spanish philanthropist and author of a Utopia, *De Commune Rerum* (1635).

VOLLMAR, GEORGE V., 1850-

Born at Munich of aristocratic family; educated by the Benedictine fathers. He entered the cavalry in 1865, and went through the Austrian campaign. He then offered his sword to the Pope, but joined the Bavarian army in the Franco-Prussian war. Wounded and crippled for life, he set himself to complete his education, and left the hospital a Socialist. He edited a Socialist paper in Dresden. Banished by Bismarck's Anti-Socialist law, he spent his exile in France and Switzerland. In 1881 he was elected to the Reichstag, but was arrested and again banished. In 1884 and in 1890 he was returned for Munich. He is the main leader of Socialism in Bavaria, and the first lieutenant of Bebel and Liebknecht, and among the more conservative of German Socialists. In 1891 he published *Ueber die nächsten Aufgaben der deutschen social Demokratie.*

WAGNER, PROF. ADOLPH, 1835-

At the age of twenty-three professor of political economy in the new Academy of Commerce at Vienna; later professor at Hamburg, Dorpat, and Freiburg; now, for twenty years, professor at Berlin. His *Die Abschaffung des privaten Grundiegenthum* (1870) takes strong ground for limiting private property in land in cities. His *Finanzwissenschaft* (vol. i., 1883) is one of the ablest discussions on finance, on which subject he is a bimetallist, and considered an authority. His *Lehrbuch der Oekonomie* (1876) is widely used. He is one of the leaders of the German Socialists of the Chair (see chapter xiii.), a vigorous supporter of Prussian paternal State Socialism, and a leader in German Protestant Christian State Socialism.

WALLACE, ALFRED RUSSEL, 1822-

This noted scientist and now avowed Socialist was born at Usk, in Monmouthshire. In 1848 he visited the Amazon river, and in 1854-62 the Malaysian Islands. He corresponded with Darwin as early as 1858, stating principles of natural selection. His first book on *Evolution* was published in 1870. He has since written other books, and *Darwinism* in 1889. He early became interested in social questions, and in 1882 published his able and radical book on *Land Nationalisation* (new edition, 1892). He has recently avowed himself a complete Nationalist or Socialist.

WALLACE, J. BRUCE, 1853-

Born in India; his father a missionary there of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. He studied on the Continent and graduated at Queen's University, Ireland, entering the Congregational ministry in 1878. In 1885 he renounced the regular ministry to devote himself to Christian Socialism, and in 1887 began to publish *Brotherhood* in Ireland. In 1891 he settled in London, and published *Brotherhood* there. In 1892 he became pastor of the South Road Church (now "The Brotherhood Church"). In January, 1894, with others he organised "The Brotherhood Trust," an organisation with the objects (1) of paying to every person employed in any branch of the concern not less than the trades union wages current in the locality where the work is done; (2) of providing out of profits, for all customers dealing with the Trust, old-age pensions and sickness and accident benefits, in proportion to the extent of their respective purchases; (3) of so organising the customers of the Trust that these shall economically supply one another's wants by productive work on co-operative farms and in co-operative workshops, factories, etc., as soon and so far as such organisation may be found practicable, and the customers may desire to avail themselves of such employment; (4) of gradually buying up as much land as possible from private owners, and of acquiring as much as possible of the most scientific means of production, for the benefit of all who may choose to connect themselves with the Trust; and (5) of promoting in any other way that the trustees may find practicable, expedient, and not inconsistent with the already mentioned objects, the well-being of the Trust's customers and co-operative workers and of their families.

WEBB, MRS. BEATRICE (*née* POTTER), 1858-

At first a pupil of Herbert Spencer, she studied actual working-class life in Lancashire, and in 1885 joined Mr. Charles Booth in his social studies, and contributed to *Life and Labour of the People.* In 1891 she published her *Co-operative Movement in Great Britain.* In 1892 she married Sidney Webb. She is a member of the Fabian Society, and especially active in bringing together the Co-operative, Trades Union and Socialist movements in Great Britain. In 1894 she was author, with her husband, of the *History of Trades Unionism.*

WEBB, SIDNEY, 1859-

Barrister-at-law; LL.B. London University; educated in Switzerland and Germany. In 1878, after some business experience, he entered the English Civil Service, in the War, Inland Revenue, and Colonial Offices. He resigned in 1891. He has been a frequent contributor to the English magazines, and has written *Socialism in England* (1889), one of the *Fabian Essays* (1889), *The Eight Hours' Day* (in connection with Harold Cox, 1891), and *The London Programme.* He was elected on the London County Council, 1892, and made chairman and vice-chairman of two of its important committees. He has been a prominent member of the Fabian Society since 1885. In 1894, with his wife, he was author of a brilliant *History of Trades Unionism.*

WEITLING, WILHELM, 1808-1874.

Often called the Father of German Communism (Socialism). Born at Magdeburg; son of a soldier, himself a tailor. He travelled all through Germany, declaring that he was converted to Communism by the reading of the New Testament, preaching a Utopian Socialism, mainly fashioned after the ideas of Fourier and Cabet. After the Revolution of 1848 he went to America, and there introduced Democratic Socialism, forming a Socialist Society in New York City, called the Arbeiterbund. Later he joined one of the Fourierist communities; and, finally, in New York City, devoted himself to reform, inventions and astronomy. He wrote *Die Menscheit wie sie ist und wie sie sein sollte* (1838), *Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit* (1842) and *Das Evangelium des Armen Sünders.* His constructive idea was a federation of the families of the world, with leaders chosen by acclamation, who should divide the products of labour, giving to all a fixed share, and to those who produced more than the average certain luxuries, on condition of their being soon consumed to prevent accumulation.

WESTCOTT, RT. REV. BROOKE FOSS.

Professor at Oxford, he became Bishop of Durham, and has been most active in working for Christian Socialism. He is president of the English Christian Social Union ; author of *An Address on Socialism*, read before the Hull Church Congress (1890), *The Incarnation and Common Life* (1893), *The Incarnation a Revelation of Human Duties* (1892). He took a leader's part on behalf of the miners in the great miners' strike.

WINKELBLACH, KARL MARLO, 1810-1865.

Professor at Marburg and Cassel. In 1850 he published his *Untersuchungen über die Organization der Arbeit, oder System der Weltökonomie*, in which he acutely analyses modern industrial evils, and advocates collective side by side with private ownership of land, and co-operative production with strict State control. Karl Marlo is the name under which he wrote.

APPENDIX B.

SOME GOOD BOOKS, AVAILABLE TO ENGLISH OR AMERICAN READERS, ON SOCIALISM AND RELATED TOPICS.

[*This list is for the general reader, and makes no pretence of being complete. The dates are those of the latest editions.*]

A. Bibliographies.

Bowker, R. R. and Iles, George. Reader's Guide in Economic, Social, and Political Science, 50*c*. Putnam, *N. Y.*, 1891.
Valuable and convenient, but not recent enough to be available for some points.

Fabian Society. Tract No. 29. What to Read; a List of Books for Social Reformers, 3*d*. Fabian Society, 1893.

Ely, R. T. Appendix to his Socialism and Social Reform, 6*s*. Sonnenschein ($1.50, Crowell, *N. Y.*), 1894.

Sonnenschein, Wm. Swan. The Best Books: a Reader's Guide to the Choice of the Best Available Books in all Departments of Literature down to 1890, with the dates of the First and Last Editions, 1200 pp., 4to, 31*s*. 6*d*. *nett*, 1891; and First Supplement, bringing the work down to Midsummer, 1894, 25*s*. *nett*. 1894. Sonnenschein; Putnam, *N. Y.*
Good on Social Sciences, which are carefully classified.

Stammhammer, Jos. Bibliographie des Socialismus und Communismus. Fischer, *Jena*, 1893.
The most complete bibliography, giving some 10,000 titles.

B. Dictionaries and Encyclopedias.

Bliss, W. D. P. Editor, Encyclopedia of Social Reform. Biographical, explanatory, historical, topical, embracing all social reforms, prepared with the co-operation of many specialists, and with each reform treated by its advocates. Large 8vo, about 1000 subjects, $6. Funk & Wagnalls, *N. Y.*, 1895; *in prep.*

Conrad, J. Handwörterbuch der Staats-Wissenschaften. Fischer, *Jena*, 1890; *in prog.*

Palgrave, R. H. I. Editor, Dictionary of Political Economy, in parts, each 3*s*. 6*d*. ($1), 8vo. Macmillan, 1891; *in prog.*

Stegmann and Hugo, $\frac{\text{C.}}{\text{C.}}$ Handbuch der Socialismus; in parts, each 80*pf.*, 8vo. Schabelitz, *Zurich*, 1894; *in prog.*

C. Statements and History of Socialism.

Bernstein and Kautsky, $\frac{\text{E.}}{\text{K.}}$ Die Geschichte des Sozialismus in Einzeln-Darstellungen. Each vol. in 20 parts, 20*pf.*, royal 8vo. Dietz, *Stuttgart*, 1894; *in prog.*

Bliss, W. D. P. A Handbook of Socialism, 2*s.* 6*d.* Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1895.

——— What Is Socialism? 5*c.* *Dawn* Office, *Boston*, 1894.

Engels, Fredk. Socialism, Utopian and Scientific, 2*s.* 6*d.* Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1892.

Fabian Society. Fabian Essays on Socialism, 1*s.* Fabian Society (25*c.*, Humboldt Co., *N. Y.*), 1892.

The best presentation of Modern Socialism.

——— Fabian Tracts, the set, bd., 3*s.* 9*d.* Fabian Society, *v. y.*

Of great value, particularly Tracts 5, Facts for Socialists; 7, Capital and Land; 8, Facts for Londoners; 15, English Progress towards Social Democracy; 29, What to Read; 41, The Fabian Society; 45, The Impossibilities of Anarchism; 51, Socialism, True and False. 5, 7, 15, 41, and 51 are 1*d.* each, or 9*d.* per doz.; 8 is 6*d.*; 29, 3*d.*; 45, 2*d.*

Gronlund, Laurence. The Co-operative Commonwealth, 50*c.* Lee & Shepherd, *Boston* (1*s.* and 2*s.* 6*d.*, Sonnenschein), 1886.

Hyndman, H. M. Historical Basis of Socialism in England, *o.p.* (pub. 8*s.* 6*d.*). Kegan Paul, 1883.

——— England for All, 6*d.* Social Democratic Federation, 1883.

Lassalle, Ferd. The Working Man's Programme, 6*d.* Social Democratic Federation, 1884.

Manifesto of English Socialists: Joint Committee of Socialist Bodies, 1*d.* Fabian Society, 1893.

Of great value.

Marx, Karl. Wage, Labour, and Capital, 2*d.* Soc. Dem. Fed., 1892.

——— and Engels, F. Manifesto of the Communist Party (1848), 2*d.* Reeves, 1888.

The first formal expression of Marxian Socialism.

Morris, Wm. Signs of Change: seven lectures, 4*s.* 6*d.* Reeves, 1884.

——— and Hyndman, H. M. Summary of the Principles of Socialism (1884), 4*d.* Social Democratic Federation, 1892.

——— and Bax, E. Belfort. Socialism: its Growth and Outcome, 6*s.* Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1893.

Sprague, Rev. F. M. Socialism from Genesis to Revelation, $1.50.
Lee & Shepherd, *Boston*, 1892.
Socialism applied to American problems. *The title does not refer to the Bible.*

Webb, Sidney. Socialism in England, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1893.

D. Critical Accounts of Socialism.

Dawson, W. H. German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1888.

——— Bismarck and State Socialism, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1890.
Both books of great interest.

Ely, R. T. The Labour Movement in America, $1.50.
Crowell, *N. Y.*, 1886.
Good on early American Socialism.

——— Socialism and Social Reform, 6*s*.
Sonnenschein ($1.50, Crowell, *N. Y.*), 1894.

Kirkup, Thomas. An Inquiry into Socialism, 5*s*., *o.p.* Longmans, 1887.

——— History of Socialism, 6*s*. Black, 1892.

Laveleye, E. de. Socialism of To-day (tr.), 6*s*.
Leadenhall Press, 1884.

Rae, John. Contemporary Socialism, 10*s*. 6*d*.
Sonnenschein ($2.50, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1891.
The best historico-critical account up to 1891.

Royal Commission on Labour. The foreign reports of the Commission give much, and, generally speaking, correct information on the Socialist movement in Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, Austria, Hungary, Norway, Sweden, Holland, and Spain. Edited by Geoffrey Drage; 5*d*. to 2*s*. 6*d*., according to size of report. Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1893-4.

——— Epitome of same by T. G. Spyers, *sub-tit.*, The Labour Question, 2*s*. 6*d*. Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1894.

Woods, R. A. English Social Movements, $1.50.
Scribner, *N. Y.* (2*s*. 6*d*., Sonnenschein, *Lond.*), 1891.
Of especial value to American readers.

E. Socialist Criticism of Social Ideals.

Bax, E. Belfort. The Religion of Socialism, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1887.

BAX, E. BELFORT. The Ethics of Socialism, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1889.

——— Outlooks from the New Standpoint, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1891.

All from the materialistic standpoint.

BEBEL, AUGUST. Woman: in the Past, Present, and Future (tr.), 5*s*.
Modern Press, 1885.

CARPENTER, EDWARD. England's Ideal, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1887.

——— Civilisation: its Cause and Cure, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1889.

Among the most interesting of Socialist essays.

——— Desirable Mansions, 1*d*. Heywood, 1883.

LLOYD, HENRY D. The New Conscience, 1*d*. Reeves, 1889.

MILL, JOHN STUART. A collection of his writings on Socialism, called "Mill on Socialism," edited by W. D. P. Bliss, 75*c*. and 25*c*.
Humboldt Publishing Co., *N. Y.*, 1892.

MORRIS, WILLIAM. Dream of John Ball, and a King's Lesson, 1*s*.
Reeves & Turner, 1889.

——— Art and Socialism, 3*d*. Reeves, 1884; *o.p.*

——— Useful Work and Useless Toil, 1*d*.
Hammersmith Socialist Society, 1893.

——— True and False Society, 1*d*.
Hammersmith Socialist Society, 1893.

——— Monopoly, 1*d*. Hammersmith Socialist Society, 1893.

——— A collection of some of his best Socialist writings and poems, called "William Morris, Poet, Artist, Socialist," edited by F. W. Lee, 75*c*. and 25*c*. Humboldt Publishing Co., *N. Y.*, 1892.

PEARSON, KARL. Ethic of Freethought, 4*s*. 6*d*.
Denny, 304 Strand, *London*, 1888.

——— Socialism in Theory and Practice, 2*d*. W. Reeves, 1887.

——— Moral Basis of Socialism, 1*d*. W. Reeves, 1887.

Materialistic.

RITCHIE, DAVID G. Darwinism and Politics, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1890.

——— Natural Rights, a criticism of some political and ethical conceptions, 10*s*. 6*d*. Sonnenschein ($2.75, Macmillan, *N. Y.*), 1894.

RUSKIN, JOHN. A collection of his Socialist writings, called "The Communism of John Ruskin," edited by W. D. P. Bliss, 75*c.* and 25*c.* Humboldt Pub. Co., *N. Y.*, 1892.

SCUDDER, MISS VIDA D. Socialism and Spiritual Progress, 10*c.* *Dawn*, *Boston*, 1891.

SHAW, G. BERNARD. Quintessence of Ibsenism, 2*s.* 6*d.* Walter Scott, 1894.

——— Widowers' Houses: a Comedy, 2*s.* 6*d.* Henry, 1893.

WILDE, OSCAR. The Soul of Man under Socialism, 15*c.* Humboldt, *N. Y.*

F. Utopias.

BACON, FRANCIS. The New Atlantis, 1*s.* Ward & Lock, 1885.

BELLAMY, EDWARD. Looking Backward, *U. S.*, $1 and 50*c.* Houghton, Mifflin, & Co., *Boston* (6*d.* and 1*s.*, W. Reeves), 1887.

HARRINGTON, J. Oceana (1656), 1*s.* Routledge, 1887.

HERTZKA, DR. Freeland (tr.), 6*s.* Chatto & Windus, 1891.

KAUFMANN, REV. M. Utopias, 5*s.* Kegan Paul, 1879.

MORE, SIR THOMAS. Utopia, with preface by Maurice Adams, 1*s.* 6*d.* Walter Scott, 1892.
Of great interest.

MORE, BACON, etc. Ideal Commonwealths, 1*s.* 6*d.* Routledge, 1885.

MORRIS, WILLIAM. News from Nowhere, 1*s.* and 1*s.* 6*d.* Reeves & Turner, 1892.
Of extreme beauty.

PLATO. The Republic, tr. by Davies and Vaughan, 2*s.* 6*d.* *nett.* $1, Macmillan, 1892.

G. Socialist Songs and Poems.

CARPENTER, EDWARD. Chants of Labour, with Music, 1*s.* Sonnenschein, 1892.

——— Towards Democracy, 5*s.* Unwin, 1892.

GLASIER, J. B. Socialist Songs, 3*d.* and 6*d.* *Glasgow*, 1893.

JOYNES, J. L. Songs of a Revolutionary Epoch, 1*s.* W. Reeves, 1888.

LEE, F. W. Poems of Progress and Songs of Strife. *in prep.*

Morris, William. Chants for Socialists, 1*d*. W. Reeves, 1885.
——— Poems by the Way, 6*s*. Reeves & Turner, 1891.
Salt, H. S. Songs of Freedom, 1*s*. Scott, 1890.

H. Controversial Books in Opposition to Socialism.

Bramwell, Lord. Economics *v*. Socialism, 1*d*.
Lib. and Prop. Def. League, 1888.

Donisthorpe, Wordsworth. Individualism: a System of Politics, 14*s*. Macmillan, 1889.

——— Law in a Free State, 6*s*. Macmillan, 1895.

Gilman, N. P. Socialism and the American Spirit, $1.75.
Houghton, *Boston* (6*s*. 6*d*., Macmillan, *Lond*.), 1893.

Kidd, Benjamin. Social Evolution, 10*s*. *nett* ($1.50). Macmillan, 1894.

A remarkable book. The author believes in State control so as to allow the universal competition which, he asserts, is biologically necessary to progress. He emphasises religion as a social force.

Levy, J. H. The Outcome of Individualism, 2*d*. King, 1892.

Mackay, T., and others. A Plea for Liberty, 2*s*. Murray, 1892.

Naquet, J. A. Collectivism and Socialism (tr.), 2*s*. 6*d*.
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1891.

A clever book by a French politician.

Schaeffle, Dr. A. Quintessence of Socialism, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1889.

Very favourable to Socialism.

——— The Impossibility of Social Democracy, 3*s*. 6*d*.
Sonnenschein ($1.25, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1891.

Spencer, Herbert. Man *versus* the State, 1*s*. Williams, 1884.

I. Christian Socialism.

Adderley, Rev. James. Christ and Social Reform, 2*d*. S.P.C.K.

Barnett, Rev. S. A., and Mrs. S. A. Practicable Socialism, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Longmans, 1894.

Bliss, Rev. W. D. P. What Christian Socialism Is.
——— Objections to Christian Socialism.
——— The History of Christian Socialism.
——— The Social Faith of the Catholic Church.
Tracts of about 20 pp., 10*c*. each. *Dawn*, *Boston*, 1894.

Ely, R. T. Social Aspects of Christianity, 90*c*. Crowell, *N. Y.*, 1889.

Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. on the Condition of Labour. May, 1891.

Fremantle, W. H. The World as a Subject of Redemption, 14*s*. ($2). Longmans, 1875.

Hancock, Rev. Thomas. The Banner of Christ in the Hands of the Socialists, 1*d*. *Church Reformer*, 8 Duke St., Adelphi, *Lond.*

——— Christ and the People, Sermons chiefly on the obligation of the Church to the State and humanity. Hodges, 1882; *o.p.*

Every Christian Socialist, and every Christian, ought to read Hancock's Sermons, which appear from time to time in *The Church Reformer.*

Headlam, Rev. Stewart D. Christian Socialism, 1*d*. Fabian Tract 42.

——— Lessons from the Cross, 1*s*. 6*d*.

——— Laws of Eternal Life, 2*s*.

——— Priestcraft and Progress, 1*s*.

——— Service of Humanity, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Church Reformer, 8 Duke St., Adelphi, *Lond.*

All these bring out the Socialism of Church teachings in a most stimulating way.

Herron, Rev. G. D. The Message of Jesus to Men of Wealth.

——— The Larger Christ, 75*c*. Revell, *N. Y.*, 1891.

——— The New Redemption, 75*c*. Crowell, *N. Y.*, 1893.

——— The Christian Society, $1. Revell, *N. Y.*, 1894.

Suggestive essays by this author; Professor of Christian Sociology at Grennelle, Iowa, U. S.

Kaufmann, Rev. M. Christian Socialism, 4*s*. 6*d*. Kegan Paul, 1888.

Kingsley, Rev. C. Alton Locke. Cheap Clothes and Nasty, 6*d*. Macmillan, 1890.

——— Yeast, 6*d*. Macmillan, 1890.

Lee, F. W. Notes on the Social Teaching of the Christian Year. Published in *The Dawn*, Feb., 1894—Feb., 1895. A revised edition in book form is now in preparation.

Marson, Rev. Charles. Churchmen and their Politics, in *Westminster Review*. Feb., 1894.

——— The Church and the Democratic Idea in *The New Party*. 2*s*. 6*d*. Hodder, 1894.

——— The Social Teaching of the Early Fathers in *Vox Clamantium*, 10*s*. 6*d*. Innes, 1894.

Mr. Marson is preparing a book on Patristic Socialism.

MAURICE, REV. J. F. D. Social Morality, 3*s.* 6*d.* ($1.25). Macmillan, 1893.

Maurice's Socialism is best studied in his general theological works and in his Life by his son. The English C. S. U. publishes a tract of his on Christian Socialism.

MAZZINI, JOSEPH. Thoughts upon Democracy in Europe—*in* Mazzini: a Memoir, by E. A. V[enturi], 5*s.* Macmillan, 1877.

——— Duties of Man, 6*d.* Alexander & Shepheard.

Invaluable. Mazzini rejected both Socialism and Christianity as they were presented to him, but his writings are full of Christian spirit and the deepest Socialism. Funk & Wagnalls, *N. Y.*, publish a cheap edition, 25*c.*, of *Duties of Man.*

——— Essays, most of them translated for the first time by Thomas Okey. Dent, 1894.

NITTI, F. S. Catholic Socialism, tr. from Italian by Killea. Sonnenschein, *in prep.*

SARSON, REV. G. The Eucharist and Common Life, with a devotional commentary on the Communion Office, 1*s.* Isbister, 1883.

Of the greatest value in showing the social teaching of the central Christian service. An American edition is in preparation.

SPRAGUE, REV. P. W. Christian Socialism, What and Why, 75*c.* and 50*c.* Dutton, *N. Y.*, 1891.

STRONG, REV. JOSIAH. Our Country, and the New Era, 25*c.* each. Baker & Taylor, *N. Y.*, 1891.

TOLSTOI, COUNT LEO. My Confession. What to Do, etc. Walter Scott, *Lond.;* Crowell, *N. Y.*

Christian Individualism rather than Socialism.

WESTCOTT, B. F., Bishop of Durham. Social Aspects of Christianity, 6*s.* Macmillan, 1887.

——— Socialism. Read before Hull Congress, 2*d.* W. Reeves, 1890.

——— The Incarnation and Common Life. Macmillan, 1893.

——— The Incarnation a Revelation of Human Duties, 6*d.* S.P.C.K., 1892.

For Christian Socialist literature, address *Church Reformer*, 8 Duke Street, Adelphi, London (*The Dawn*, Boston, Mass.).

J. Anarchism.

BAKUNIN, M. God and the State, tr. by B. R. Tucker. *N. Y.*, 1883.

CHICAGO ANARCHISTS. Their Speeches in Court, 4*d.*, 4th edit. Reeves, 1891.

DUBOIS, FELIX. The Anarchist Peril, tr. from the French by Ralph Derechoff, 4*s.* Unwin ($1.75, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1894.

An account of revolutionary Anarchism; hostile.

KROPOTKINE, PRINCE. Appeal to the Young.
Soc. Dem. Fed., 337 Strand.

——— Anarchist Communism: its Basis and Principles, 2*d.*
W. Reeves, 1891.

——— The Commune of Paris. The Wage System. Anarchist Morality. War, 1*d.* each. W. Reeves.

——— Law and Authority, 2*d.* Internat. Pub. Co., 1886.

PROUDHON, P. J. Property, tr. by B. R. Tucker, $1.
Humboldt Pub. Co., *N. Y.*

——— System of Economical Contradictions, tr. by B. R. Tucker, $3.50. Tucker, *N. Y.*, 1888.

RECLUS, JACQUES ELISÉE. Evolution and Revolution, 1*d.* Reeves, 1891.

——— An Anarchist on Anarchy, 10*c.* Tucker, *N. Y.*

SHAW, G. B. The Impossibilities of Anarchism, 2*d.* Fabian Tract.

TUCKER, B. R. Instead of a Book, 50*c.* Tucker, *N. Y.*, 1893.

For the literature of Philosophic Anarchism, address *Liberty*, P. O. Box 1312, New York City, U. S.

K. Co-operation.

CO-OPERATIVE CONGRESS REPORT (Annual), 1*s.*

CO-OPERATIVE WHOLESALE SOCIETY'S ANNUAL, 4*s.*

CO-OPERATIVE PAMPHLETS (List on application).
Co-operative Union, *Mancs.*

GILMAN, N. P. Profit Sharing, $1.75.
Houghton, *Bost.* (7*s.* 6*d.*, Macmillan), 1889.

HOLYOAKE, G. J. History of Co-operation in England, 2 vols., 14*s.*
Paul, 1885.

——— The Rochdale Pioneers, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1893.

JONES, B. Co-operative Production.
Oxford Clarendon Press ($3.50 *nett.*, Macmillan, *N. Y.*), 1894.

NEALE, E. V., and HUGHES, T. Manual for Co-operators, 1*s.*
Co-operative Union, 1881.

POTTER, BEATRICE (Mrs. Sidney Webb). The Co-operative Movement in Great Britain, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1891.

——— Co-operation and Trades Unionism, 1*d.*
Co-operative Union, *Mancs.*, 1892.

For other countries see reports of the Royal Commission on Labour as above.

L. Eight Hours' Movement.

BRADLAUGH, CHARLES. The Eight Hours' Movement, 2*d*. Forder, 1888.

HADFIELD, R. A., and GIBBINS, H. DE B. A Shorter Working Day, 2*s*. 6*d*. Methuen, 1892.

HYNDMAN, H. M. Mr. Gladstone and the Eight Hours' Law, 1*d*. Soc. Dem. Fed., 1892.

MANN, TOM. The Eight Hours' Day, and how to get it by Trade and Local Option, 1*d*. Reeves, 1891.

RAE, JOHN. Eight Hours for Work, 4*s*. 6*d*. *nett* ($1 25*c*.). Macmillan, 1894.

ROBERTSON, J. M. The Eight Hours' Movement, 2*s*. 6*d*. Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1893.

TRANT, WM. Trades Unions: their Origin and Objects, Influence and Efficacy, 1*s*. Kegan Paul.

——— Same, abridged, 10*c*. American Federation of Labour, De Soto Block, *Indianapolis*.

WEBB, SIDNEY, and COX, HAROLD. The Eight Hours' Day, 1*s*. (Contains a Bibliography of English books, articles, etc.) W. Scott, 1891.

For excellent American tracts on this subject, address American Federation of Labour.

M. Land.

COX, HAROLD. Land Nationalisation, 2*s*. 6*d*. Methuen, 1892.

DAWSON, W. H. The Unearned Increment, 2*s*. 6*d*. Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1890.

FLUERSCHEIM, M. Rent, Interest, and Wages, 4*s*. 6*d*. W. Reeves, 1891.

GEORGE, HENRY. The Condition of Labour, 2*s*. 6*d*. Sonnenschein, 1891.

——— Progress and Poverty, 1*s*. Paul ($1, Appleton, *N. Y.*), 1880.

——— The Land Question, 1*s*. W. Reeves.

POLLOCK, SIR F. The Land Laws, 2*s*. 6*d*. Macmillan, 1893.

SPENCE, THOMAS. Nationalisation of the Land (1775). Notes by H. M. Hyndman, 1*d*. Soc. Dem. Fed., 1882.

STORY OF MY DICTATORSHIP (anon.), 1*s*. Bliss & Sands, 1894.

SYMPOSIUM ON THE LAND QUESTION, 1*s.*, paper. Unwin, 1890.

WALKER, F. A. Land and its Rent, $1.
Little & Brown, *Boston* (3*s.* 6*d.*, Macmillan, *London*), 1893.

WALLACE, A. R. Land Nationalisation, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1892.

English Land Restoration League (8 Duke St., Adelphi, Lond.) and Land Nationalisation Society (47 Victoria St., Lond.) both issue valuable publications.

N. Trades Unionism.

BRENTANO, L. History of Guilds and Trades Unions, *o.p.*, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Paul, 1870.

HOBHOUSE, L. T. The Labour Movement, 3*s.* 6*d.* Unwin, 1893.

HOWELL, GEORGE. The Conflicts of Labour and Capital. A history of the Trades Unions of Great Britain, 7*s.* 6*d.* Macmillan, 1890.

——— Trades Unionism, New and Old, 2*s.* 6*d.* Methuen, 1891.

MCNEILL, G. E. The Labour Movement, $3.75.
Bridgman, *Boston*, 1886.
The best American book on the subject.

WEBB, SIDNEY, and MRS. BEATRICE (POTTER) WEBB. History of Trades Unionism, 18*s.* *nett* ($5). Longmans, 1894.
The best English book on the subject. With Bibliography (45 pp.) by R. A. Peddie.

For other countries see Reports of Royal Commission on Labour.

O. Woman Question.

ANTHONY, A. Social and Political Dependence of Woman, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Longmans, 1880.

AVELING, DR. EDWARD. The Woman Question, 2*d.* Sonnenschein.

BEBEL, AUGUST. Woman in the Past, Present, and Future (tr.), 5*s.*
Modern Press, 1885.

FIFTH REPORT OF U. S. COMMISSIONER OF LABOUR ON MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE IN THE U. S. AND EUROPE. *Washington*, 1889.

CREPAZ, ADELE. The Emancipation of Woman, and its probable consequences, 2*s.* 6*d.* Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1893.

LAURENCE, B. E. History of the Laws affecting Married Women, 5*s.* Reeves & Turner, 1884.

LENNARD, T. B. Position of Women in Law, 6*s.* Waterlow, 1883.

MILL, J. STUART. The Subjection of Women, 1*s.* 4*d.*, *o.p.* Longmans, 1884.

OSTROGORSKI, M. The Rights of Women, 2*s.* 6*d.* Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1893.

RUSKIN, JOHN. Sesame and Lilies, 5*s.* Allen, 1886.

SHIRREFF, EMILY. Intellectual Education and its Influence on Women, 6*s.* Smith & Elder, 1862.

STANTON, T. Woman Question in Europe (by 24 Contributors), 12*s.* 6*d.* Low, 1884.

WOMEN'S PROGRESSIVE SOCIETY. Bibliography of Books, etc., on Women, 3*d.* Mrs. Grenfell, 12 John St., *Lond.*, 1892.

WOLLSTONECRAFT, MARY. A Vindication of the Rights of Women (1791), 7*s.* 6*d.* Unwin, 1890 : also 1*s.* 6*d.*, Walter Scott, 1891.

For Woman's Suffrage literature, address National Society for Woman's Suffrage, 10 Gt. College St., Lond., S.W., or *Woman's Rights Journal*, Park St., Boston, Mass., U.S.A.

P. Political Economy.

ASHLEY, W. J. [ed.]. Economic Classics. A Series of Reprints, 3*s.* (75*c.*) each. Macmillan, 1895.

BÖHM-BAWERK, E. Capital and Interest, tr. by W. Smart, 12*s.* *nett* ($4). Macmillan, 1890.

——— The Positive Theory of Capital, 12*s.* *net.* ($4). Macmillan, 1891.

COMMONS, J. R. Distribution of Wealth, $1.75*c.* (7*s.*). Macmillan, 1893.

COSSA, LUIGI. Introduction to Study of Political Economy, tr. from Italian by L. Dyer, 8*s.* 6*d.* ($2.60) *nett.* Macmillan, 1893.
Traces development and present position of Political Economy in all countries.

ELY, DR. R. T. Outlines of Economics, $1. (Hunt & Eaton, *N. Y.*), 1893.

HOBSON, J. A. The Evolution of Capitalism, 3*s.* 6*d.* Scott ($1.25, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1894.

INGRAM, J. K. Progress and Prospects of Political Economy. Sonnenschein ; *in prep.*

——— History of Political Economy, 6*s.* A. & C. Black, 1888.
Dwells on the Sociologic side.

KEYNES, J. N. The Scope and Method of Political Economy, 7*s.* 6*d.* ($2.25). Macmillan, 1891.

MARSHALL, A. Principles of Economics, vol. i., 12*s.* 6*d.* *nett* ($3).
Macmillan, 1890.

To be completed in a second vol.

——— Elements of the Economics of Industry, vol. i., 3*s.* 6*d.* ($1).
Macmillan, 1892.

Prof. Marshall is considered by many the leading living English Economist.

MARX, KARL. Capital, tr. by Moore and Aveling, 10*s.* 6*d.*
Sonnenschein, 1889.

——— The Student's Marx. By E. B. Aveling, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1891.

MILL, J. STUART. Principles of Political Economy.
Longmans, 1885, 3*s.* 6*d.*; Routledge, 1892, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Cossa calls Mill's "even now the best English treatise on Economics".

——— Essays on some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy, 6*s.* 6*d.*, *o.p.* Longmans, 1874.

PALGRAVE, R. H. I. Dictionary of Political Economy, in parts.
Macmillan, 1891; *in progress.*

PATTON, S. N. The Consumption of Wealth, 50*c.*
University of Pennsylvania, 1889.

——— The Promises of Political Economy, $1.50.
Lippincott, *Phil.*, 1885.

PRICE, L. L. History of English Political Economy since Adam Smith, 2*s.* 6*d.* Methuen, 1891.

SYMES, REV. PROF. J. E. Political Economy, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Longmans, 1889.

One of the best short treatises.

WALKER, F. A. Political Economy, 12*s.* 6*d.*
Macmillan ($2.50, Holt, *N. Y.*), 1888.

——— First Lessons in Political Economy, 5*s.*
Macmillan ($1, Holt, *N. Y.*), 1890.

ECONOMIC PERIODICALS.

ECONOMIC JOURNAL (British Economic Assocn.), 20*s.* per annum.
Macmillan.

ECONOMIC REVIEW (Christian Social Union), 10*s.* 6*d.* Percival.

POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY (Columbia College), $3.

THE JOURNAL OF POLITICAL ECONOMY (University of Chicago), $3.

QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS (Harvard University), $3.
Macmillan.

The American Economic Association and the American Academy of Political and Social Science publish valuable economic monographs, the latter at very reasonable prices; both quite progressive. The *Journal des Economistes*, and the *Revue d'Economie Politique*, represent respectively the orthodox and the more advanced French Economists. *La Reform Sociale* is the organ of the movement founded by Le Play. The *Vierteljahrschrift für Volkswirthschaft und Culturgeschichte*, the *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik*, Schmoller's *Jahrbücher für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung und Volkswirthschaft*, represent, in that order, the more conservative and progressive tendencies in Germany. The *Giornale degli Economiste* and *La Reforma Sociale* are the authorities for Italy. Columbia College, N. Y., the University of Pennsylvania (Phil.), and the Johns Hopkins University all publish valuable series of economic monographs.

Q. Sociology.

COMTE, AUG. Positive Philosophy, tr. and condensed by Harriet Martineau, 25*s*. Kegan Paul, 1883.

GIDDINGS, F. H. The Theory of Sociology, 50*c*.
Amer. Acad. of Pol. and Soc. Science, *Phil.*, 1894.

——— The Province of Sociology, 25*c*.
Amer. Acad. of Pol. and Soc. Science, *Phil.* 1894.

KIDD, BENJ. Social Evolution. See above.

MACKENZIE, J. S. An Introduction to Social Philosophy, 10*s*. 6*d*.
MACLEHOSE, *Glasgow* ($2.60, Macmillan, *N. Y.*), 1890.

PSYCHIC FACTORS OF CIVILISATION. Ginn, *Boston*, 1893.

The Science is yet in its infancy. Mr. Stephen, President of the Social and Political Education League, said, in 1872: "There is no Science of Sociology properly scientific". Prof. F. H. Giddings of Columbia College, N. Y., has written several essays, and is preparing a work on Sociology of which much is expected.

SPENCER, HERBERT. Principles of Sociology, 2 vols., 39*s*.
Williams, 1882-9.

——— The Study of Sociology, 5*s*.
Kegan Paul ($1.75, Appleton, *N. Y.*), 1880.

——— Principles of Ethics. Vol. i. Data of Ethics, 15*s*. Vol. ii. part i. Justice, 8*s*. Williams & Norgate, 1892.
Cheap edition of Spencer's works, Humboldt Pub. Co., *N. Y.*

WARD, LESTER F. Dynamic Sociology, 2 vols., $5.
Appleton, *N. Y.*, 1883.

The best Sociology yet; though grossly Materialistic.

R. The State.

Beaulieu, P. Leroy. The Modern State (tr.), 2*s.* 6*d.*
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1891.

Bluntschli, J. C. The Theory of the State (tr.), 12*s.* 6*d.*
Clarendon Press ($3, Macmillan, *N. Y.*), 1892.
Many authorities referred to in notes.

Fichte, J. G. The Science of Rights (tr.), 12*s.* 6*d.* Paul, 1889.

Godwin, W. Political Justice, edited by H. S. Salt (Selection), 2*s.* 6*d.* Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1890.

Jevons, W. S. State in Relation to Labour, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Macmillan, 1892.

Pollock, Sir F., Bart. History of the Science of Politics, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Macmillan, 1890.

Ritchie, D. G. Principles of State Interference, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1891.

——— Darwinism and Politics, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1895.

Sidgwick, Henry. The Elements of Politics, 15*s.* ($4).
Macmillan, 1894.

Wilson, Woodrow. The State (a sketch of institutional history and administration), $2. Heath, *Boston*, 1892.

S. History.

(*a*) *Early Society.*

Fustel de Coulanges, N. D. Origin of Property in Land, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1891.

——— The Ancient City (tr.), $1.60. Lee & Shepherd, *Boston*, 1878.

Gomme, G. L. The Village Community, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Scott ($1.25, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1890.

Hearn, W. E. The Aryan Household, 16*s.* Longmans, 1879.

Laveleye, E. de. Primitive Property (tr.), 12*s.*, *o.p.*
Macmillan, 1878.

Maine, Sir H. Village Communities, 9*s.* Murray, 1876.

——— Early Law and Custom, 9*s.* Murray, 1883.

——— Ancient Law, 9*s.* Murray, 1885.

——— The Early History of Institutions, 9*s.* Murray, 1875.

——— Village Communities in the East and West, 9*s.* Murray, 1876.

MORGAN, L. H. Ancient Society, $4. Holt, *N. Y.*, 1891.

SEEBOHM, F. The English Village Community, 16*s.* Longmans, 1884.

STARCKE, C. N. The Primitive Family, 5*s.* (With bibliography.) Paul ($1.75, Appleton, *N. Y.*), 1889.

WESTERMARCH, E. History of Human Marriage, 14*s. nett.* Macmillan, 1891.

(*b*) *Mediæval.*

ASHLEY, W. J. An Introduction to English Economic History and Theory. Vol. i. (Middle Ages), 5*s.* ($1.50). (List of authorities with each chapter.) Vol. ii. (End of Middle Ages), 10*s.* 6*d.* ($3). Longmans (Putnam, *N. Y.*), 1888.

CARLYLE, T. Past and Present, 1*s.* Chapman, 1891.

CUNNINGHAM, W. Growth of English Industry and Commerce. Vol. i. Early and Middle Ages, 16*s.* Vol. ii. Modern Times, 18*s.* Cambridge Press (Macmillan, *N. Y.*), 1890-92.

ROGERS, J. E. THOROLD. History of Agriculture and Prices [1259-1793], 6 vols., 142*s.* Clarendon Press (Macmillan, *N. Y.*), 1888.

——— Six Centuries of Work and Wages, 10*s.* 6*d.* Sonnenschein, 1889; new edition, 1894. Selected Chapters, 2*s.* 6*d.* ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*)

——— The Economic Interpretation of History, 2nd edition, 7*s.* 6*d.* Unwin, 1891.

STUBBS, W. Constitutional History of England [to 1485], 3 vols., 36*s.* Clarendon Press (Macmillan, *N. Y.*), 1883-91.

(*c*) *Modern.*

BAGEHOT, WALTER. The English Constitution, 7*s.* 6*d.* Paul ($2, Appleton, *N. Y.*), 1885.

CARLYLE, T. Chartism [1839], in Essays, vol. v., 1*s.* Chapman, 1891.

ELY, R. T. The Labour Movement in America, 5*s.* Heinemann ($1, Crowell, *Boston*, 1886), 1890.

FREEMAN, E. A. Growth of the English Constitution, 5*s.* Macmillan, 1884.

GIBBINS, H. DE B. The Industrial History of England, 2*s.* 6*d.* Methuen, 1894.

McCarthy, Justin. Short History of Our Own Times, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Chatto, 1890.

McNeill. The Labour Movement (in the United States), $3.75.
Bridgman, *Boston*, 1886.

Nordhoff, C. Communistic Societies of the United States, 15*s.*
Murray ($4, Harper, *N. Y.*), 1875.

Noyes, J. H. History of American Socialisms, 5*s.*
W. Reeves ($3.50, Lippincott, *Phil.*), 1870.

Plener, E. von. English Factory Legislation, 3*s.* Chapman, 1873.

Skottowe, B. C. Short History of Parliament, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1891.

Stubbs, Rev. C. W. The Land and the Labourers, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1891.

Toynbee, Arnold. The Industrial Revolution of the 18th Century in England, 10*s.* 6*d.* Longmans, 1887.

See also Socialism, Co-operation, Land, Trades Unionism, etc.

T. Biographies.

Gibbins, H. de B., M.A. English Social Reformers (More, Maurice. Kingsley, Carlyle, Ruskin, etc.), 2*s.* 6*d.* Methuen, 1892.

Kingsley, Charles. Life of, by M. Kaufmann, M.A., 5*s.* Paul, 1892,

Lassalle, F. German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle, by W. H. Dawson, 2*s.* 6*d.* Sonnenschein ($1, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1891.

Lovett, W. Life and Struggles of William Lovett, 5*s.*, *o.p.*
Paul, 1876.

Maurice, F. D. Life, by Col. F. Maurice, 2 vols., 16*s.*
Macmillan ($5, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1884.

Mazzini, J. A Memoir, by E. A. Venturi, 6*d.*
Alexander & Shepheard.

——— Life, by W. L. Courtney, 1*s.*
Scott (40*c.* Whittaker, *N. Y.*), 1889.

Mill, J. Stuart. Autobiography, *o.p.* Longmans, 1873.

Owen, Robert. Life, by Lloyd Jones, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Sonnenschein ($1.25, Scribner, *N. Y.*), 1895.

Ruskin, John. Life, by Patrick Geddes, 1*s.* Brown, *Edin.*, 1884.

Shaftesbury, Lord. Life, by E. Hodder, 3*s.* 6*d.* Cassell, 1892.

SMITH, ADAM. Life, by B. B. Haldane, 1*s*.
Scott (40*c*., Whittaker, *N. Y.*), 1887.

——— Life, by John Rae. *in prep*.

TOYNBEE, ARNOLD. Life, by F. C. Montague, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Froude (50*c*., Johns Hopkins University, *Baltim*.), 1889.

U. Statistics.

BOOTH, CHARLES. Labour and Life of the People [new edition], 4 vols., 3*s*. 6*d*. ($1.50) each. Vol. of Maps, 5*s*. Macmillan, 1892.

EDWARDS, JOSEPH. Editor, The Labour Annual, 1*s*.
Labour Press Society, *Manchester*, 1895.

FABIAN SOCIETY. Facts for Socialists, and Facts for Londoners; tracts, 1*d*. and 6*d*.

FINANCIAL REFORM ALMANAC (Annual), 1*s*.
18 Hackin's Hey, *Liverpool*.

GIFFEN, R. Growth of Capital, 7*s*. 6*d*. Bell, 1891.

——— Progress of the Working Classes, 3*s*. Bell, 1884.

——— Recent Rate of Material Progress in England, 1*s*. Bell, 1887.

LABOUR GAZETTE (Monthly), 1*d*. Veale & Co., Cursitor St., *Lond*.

LEVI, LEONE. History of English Commerce [1763-1878], 18*s*.
Murray, 1880.

——— Wages and Earnings of the Working Classes, 3*s*. 6*d*.
Murray, 1885.

MEINTZER. A History of Statistics; A History of Theory and Technique, tr. by R. P. Faulkner, 50*c*.
Amer. Acad. of Pol. and Soc. Science, *Phil*., 1891.

MULHALL, M. G. Dictionary of Statistics, 31*s*. 6*d*. ($12).
Routledge, 1894.

——— History of Prices [1850-1885], 6*s*. Longmans, 1885.

——— Fifty Years of National Progress, 1*s*. Routledge, 1887.

PORTER, G. R. Progress of the Nation, *o.p*., 2nd edition. 1851.

QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE STATISTICAL SOCIETY, 5*s*.

STATISTICAL SOCIETY'S LIBRARY CATALOGUE, 2 vols., 20*s*. (An excellent bibliography.) Stanford, 1889.

UNITED STATES LABOUR REPORTS, National and State. An Index to which is published by the United States Labour Bureau.

Special Report, 1893. All that are in print can be had gratuitously, by addressing the Commissions of Labour at Washington, or the State capitals. The American Statistical Association (D. R. Dewey, Secretary, Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.) issues four valuable pamphlets a year, $2 per year. The *Statesman's Year Book*, Macmillan, 10*s.* 6*d.*, and *Whitaker's Almanac*, 1*s.*, in England, and the *Tribune* and *World Almanacs* in the United States, 25*c.* each, are reliable and good. United States Labour Reports are of very unequal value.

WELLS, D. A. Recent Economic Changes, $2.
Appleton, *N. Y.*, 1889.

For other countries see Foreign Reports of Royal Commission on Labour, with lists of authorities given for each country.

W. Currency.

ANDREWS, E. B. An Honest Dollar, 75*c.* Amer. Econ. Assoc., 1889.

CUNNINGHAM, W. The Use and Abuse of Money, 3*s.* Murray, 1891.

GIFFEN, ROB. The Case against Bimetallism, 7*s.* 6*d.* Bell, 1892.

JEVONS. Money and the Mechanism of Exchange, 5*s.* Paul, 1878.

KITSON, ARTHUR. A Scientific Solution of the Money Question, $1.25. Arena Pub. Co., *Boston*, 1894.

A plea for symbolic money.

LEARETT, SAMUEL. Our Money Wars, 50*c.*
Arena Pub. Co., *Boston*, 1894.

The greenback and people's party views.

TAUSSIG, F. W. The Silver Situation in the United States, 75*c.*
Amer. Econ. Assoc. (2*s.* 6*d.*, Sonnenschein), 1890.

WALKER, F. A. Money, $4. Holt, *N. Y.* (1*s.* 6*d.*, Macmillan), 1878.

X. Various Books of Importance for Socialists.

CARLYLE'S Chartism, in vol. v. of Essays. Chapman, 1891.

HOLES, JAMES. National Railways. Cassell, 1893.

Author is Secretary of the Association of Commerce of Great Britain, and favours purchase of railroads by the State.

LLOYD, HY. D. A Strike of Millionaires against Miners, 50*c.*
Bedford Clarke, *Chicago*, 1890.

STICHNEY, A. B. The Railway Problem, $2.
Nevvell, *St. Paul, Minn.*, 1891.

SULLIVAN, J. W. Direct Representation.
True Nationalist Pub. Co., *N. Y.*, 1893.

BEMIS, E. W. Municipal Ownership of Gas in the U. S., $1.
Amer. Econ. Assoc. (3*s.* 6*d.*, Sonnenschein), 1871.

LLOYD, H. D. Wealth against Commonwealth, $2.50.
Harper, *N. Y.*, 1894.
Chiefly a history of the Standard Oil monopoly.

MULFORD, E. The Nation, $2.50. Houghton, *Boston*, 1889.

REYNOLDS, M. T. The Housing of the Poor in American Cities, $1.
Amer. Econ. Assoc. (3*s.* 6*d.*, Sonnenschein), 1894.

SALT, H. S. Animals' Rights, considered in Relation to Social Progress, 2*s.* Bell (75*c.*, Macmillan, *N. Y.*), 1894.

SCHLOSS, D. F. Methods of Industrial Remuneration, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Williams ($3.50, Putnam, *N. Y.*), 1894.

SHAW, ALBERT. Municipal Government in Great Britain, $2.
Century Co., *N. Y.*, 1895.

TAYLOR, R. W. C. The Modern Factory System, 10*s.* 6*d.*
Kegan Paul, 1891.

——— The Factory System, 2*s.* 6*d.* Methuen, 1891.

WARNER, AMOS G. American Charities, $1.75.
Crowell, *Boston*, 1895.

WILLOUGHBY, W. F., and GRAFFENREID, CLARE DE. Two Prize Essays on Child Labour, 75*c.*
Amer. Econ. Assoc. (2*s.* 6*d.*, Sonnenschein), 1890.

APPENDIX C.

SOCIALIST PAPERS AND MAGAZINES.

I. English.

Justice. Weekly. Organ of Social Democratic Federation. 1889 to date. 37A Clerkenwell Green, *London*, E. C.

The Labour Leader. Weekly. Organ of the Independent Labour Party. Keir Hardie, editor. 53 Fleet St., *London*, E.C.

Fabian News. Monthly. Bulletin of the Fabian Society. 276 Strand, *London*, S.W.

Land and Labour. Monthly. Organ of the Land Nationalisation Society. 47 Victoria St., Westminster, *London*, S.W.

Brotherhood. Monthly. Organ of the Land Nationalisation Society and Brotherhood Trust. J. B. Wallace, editor. 17 Fann St., *London.*

The Church Reformer. Monthly. Organ of the Guild of St. Matthew, and of the Church and Stage Guild. Rev. S. D. Headlam, editor. 8 Duke St., Adelphi, *London*, W.C.

Goodwill. Monthly. Christian Socialist paper, adapted for use in parishes. Hon. and Rev. J. Adderley, editor. 128 Edgware Road, *London*, W.

Labour Gazette. Monthly. Organ of the English Labour Department. 1892 to date.

Economic Review. Quarterly. 1891 to date. Organ of the (Eng.) Christian Social Union. Macmillan, *London.*

Clarion. Weekly Illustrated Labour Paper. Robert Blatchford ("Nunquam"), editor. 1*d.* 72 Fleet Street, *London.*

II. French.

L'Intransigéant. A daily, edited by Henri Rochefort, with a circulation of 140,000. It is distinctively a political fighting paper, caring little for theory.

La Petite République. Founded and edited by M. Millerand. This is also more political than educational, and has as its especial aim to draw the various groups together, the leader of each group writing the editorial leaders in turns.

Le Socialiste. A Marxist weekly, edited by Guesde and Lafargue, the sons-in-law of Marx, and circulating mainly in the provinces.

Le Parti Socialiste. Weekly. Organ of the Blanquists, circulating chiefly in Paris.

Le Parti Ouvrier. A bi-weekly organ of the Allemanists, edited by Allemane.

La Revue Socialiste. A monthly long edited by Malon.

La Réforme Sociale is the organ of the Le Play social movement.

L'Economie Sociale favours profit sharing.

L'Esprit de la Femme is a woman's journal.

III. German.

"*Vorwärts,*" *Berliner Volksblatt.* Daily. Official organ of the Social Democratic Party. W. Liebknecht, editor. 1876 to date. *Berlin.*

Der Sozial Demokrat. Weekly edition of the above.

Die Neue Zeit. Weekly. "Revue des geistigen und öffentlichen Lebens." Karl Kantsky, editor. 1883 to date. *Stuttgart.*

Der Wahre Jacob. Semi-monthly. Comic Socialistic paper. 1878 to date. *Stuttgart.*

Süddeutscher Postillon. Semi-monthly. Illustrated. 1882 to date. *Munich.*

Mitteilungen des Evangelisch-Socialen Congresses. Organ of the Evangelical Socialists. Monthly. *Berlin.*

Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung, und Volkswirthschaft. Schmoller editor since 1881. Founded by Holtgendorff in 1872.

Sozial-Politisches Centralblatt. Weekly. Newspaper as to Social Science and industrial conditions. Dr. Braun, editor. 10*m.* per year. *Berlin.*

IV. Belgium.

Le Peuple. Daily. The leading Socialist paper of Belgium in the French language. *Brussels.*

L'Etudiant Socialiste. Annual. Organ of the Fédération des Etudiants Socialistes belge. *Brussels.*

Vooruit. Weekly. The leading Socialist paper of Belgium in Flemish.

V. United States.

The People. Weekly. Organ (in the English language) of the American Socialist Labour Party. *New York City.*

Voervärts. Weekly. Organ (in the German language) of the American Socialist Labour Party. *New York City.*

The Twentieth Century. Weekly. It favours Socialism and the movements towards Independent Labour Political Parties. Humboldt Pub. Co., *New York City.*

New Yorker Volkszeitung. Daily. Leading German Socialist paper in America. 1879 to date.

The Dawn. Monthly. Organ of American Christian Socialism. *Boston, Mass.*

VI. Other Countries.

Austria. *Arbeiter Zeitung.* Weekly. Organ of the Austrian Social Democratic Party. *Vienna.*

Denmark. *Social Demokratin.* Daily organ of Social Democrats. *Copenhagen.*

Holland. *Recht voor Allen.* Daily. Nieuwenhuis' organ of the social movement. *The Hague.*

Norway and Sweden. *Sozial Demokret.* Daily. *Göthenburg.*

Australia. Many papers. One of the best Socialist papers is *The Worker* of Queensland.

New Zealand. *The Journal of the Department of Labour.* 1893—2*d.* Address, Samuel Costall, Wellington, N. Y.

APPENDIX D.

A SOCIALIST CALENDAR OF MEMORABLE EVENTS.

Jan. 1 Emancipation of Slaves, U. S., 1863.
,, 2 Blanqui (Socialist) d. Paris, 1881.
,, 15 Proudhon b. Besançon, France, 1809.
,, 21 Louis XVI. beheaded, Paris, 1793.
,, 22 Bacon b. London, 1561.
,, 27 Fichte d. Berlin, 1817.
,, 29 Thomas Paine b. Deptford (Eng.), 1737.
,, 31 Gall d. Treves, 1863. "The first German Socialist."

Feb. 5 Carlyle d. London, 1881.
,, 7 Dickens b. Portsmouth, 1812.
,, 12 Gall, "the first German Socialist," gives up his position to agitate for Socialism.
,, 17 Heine d. Paris, 1856.
,, 21-24 Revolution in Paris, 1848.
,, 22 Washington b. Westmoreland, Va., 1732.
,, ,, Bebel b. Cologne, 1840.
,, 26 Victor Hugo b. Besançon, 1802.
,, 27 Lamennais d. France, 1854.

Mar. 10 Mazzini d. Pisa, 1872.
,, 18 Declaration of the Commune, 1871.
,, ,, Karl Marx d. London, 1883.
,, 29 Liebknecht b. Giessen (Ger.), 1826.

April 1 F. D. Maurice d. London, 1872.
,, 2 Zola b. Paris, 1840.
,, 7 Fourier b. Besançon, France, 1772.
,, 10 First Swiss Workmen's (State) Secretary elected, 1887.
,, 11 Lassalle b. Breslau, 1825.
,, 12 Lassalle's Berlin Address, 1862.
,, 21 Eight Hour Day, Australia, 1856.

May 1 International Labour Day.
„ „ St. Philip and St. James' Day. Apostles of Labour.
„ „ Haymarket Square Riot, Chicago, 1886.
„ 8 J. S. Mill d. Avignon, 1873.
„ 14 Robert Owen b. Newtown, Wales, 1771.
„ 15 Karl Marx d. Halle, 1799.
„ 19 Lassalle's Victory over Schulze-Delitzsch, 1863.
„ „ Saint-Simon d. Paris, 1825.
„ „ Fichte b. Rammenau (Ger.), 1762.
„ 25 Universal German Workmen's Association, Leipsic, 1863.
„ „ Wm. L. Garrison d. New York City, 1879.
„ 27 Babœuf hung, Paris, 1797.

June 2 Rousseau d. near Paris, 1778.
„ 8 Thomas Paine d. New York, 1809.
„ 9 Dickens d. near London, 1870.
„ 12 Kingsley b. Holme (Eng.), 1819.
„ 15 Magna Charta signed, Runnimede (Eng.), 1215.
„ 28 Rousseau b. Geneva, 1712.

July 1 Bakunin d. Berne, 1876.
„ 4 Declaration of Independence, U. S., 1776.
„ 14 Fall of the Bastile, Paris, 1789.
„ 15 John Ball hanged, St. Albans, 1381.
„ 27-29 Revolution in Paris, 1830.

Aug. 4. Shelley b. Field Place (Eng.), 1792.
„ 7 Socialist Congress at Eisenach, 1869.
„ 12 Rodbertus b. Greifswald (Ger.), 1805.
„ 19 Congress at Gotha (Ger.), 1876.
„ 27 Hegel b. Stuttgart, 1770.
„ 31 Lassalle d. Switzerland, 1864.

Sept. 1 M. in Labour Day, U. S.
„ 4 French Republic declared, 1870.
„ 9 Tolstoi b. St. Petersburg, 1828.
„ 21 First French Republic declared, 1828.
„ 28 International organised in London, 1864.
„ 30 Anti-Socialist Law (Ger.) expires, 1890.

Oct. 8 Fourier d. France, 1837.
„ 12 Considerant b. Salins (Jura), 1808.
„ 16 John Brown seizes Harper's Ferry, Va., 1859.

Oct. 17 Saint-Simon b. Paris, 1760.
,, 19 Anti-Socialist Law (Ger.), 1878.
,, 29 Louis Blanc b. Madrid, 1811.

Nov. 9 Cabet d. St. Louis, 1856.
,, 11 Four Chicago Anarchists hung, 1887.
,, 13 "Bloody Sunday," Trafalgar Square, London, 1887.
,, 17 Robert Owen d. 1858.
,, 20 Victor Hugo d. Paris, 1885.

Dec. 2 John Brown hung, Charlestown, S. C., 1859.
,, 4 Carlyle b. Ecclefechan (Scot.), 1795.
,, 6 Louis Blanc d. Cannes, 1882.
,, 10 Wm. L. Garrison b. Newburyport, Mass., 1805.
,, 13 Heine b. Düsseldorf, 1799.
,, 17 Whittier b. Haverhill, Mass., 1807.
,, 25 Ketteler b. Münster (Ger.), 1811.
,, 28 Gall b., "the first German Socialist".

Christmas, Birthday of Jesus Christ.
Good Friday, Crucifixion of Jesus Christ.
Whitsunday, Birthday of "The World's First International".

APPENDIX E.

CHRONOLOGY OF SOCIALISTIC LITERATURE.

(1) *Before the Nineteenth Century.*

c. 1490 B.C.	*Socialistic Laws of the Hebrew Theocracy.*
c. 370 ,,	Plato's *Republic* and *Laws.*
c. 350 ,,	Aristotle's *Politics.*
50-100 A.D.	Lives of Christ.
50-400 ,,	Writings of Apostles and Church Fathers.
c. 1260 ,,	Thomas Aquinas' Works.
c. 1360 ,,	John Ball's Preaching.
1377 ,,	Langland's *Piers Plowman.*
1516 ,,	More's *De optimo Reipublicae Statu, deque nova insula Utopia.*
1525 ,,	Munger's Preaching.
1552 ,,	Doni's *Mondi, Celesti, Terrestri, et Infernati.*
1607 ,,	Campanilla's *Civitas Solis.*
1627 ,,	Bacon's *New Atlantis* (written 1614-17).
1635 ,,	*Vivis de Communione Rerum.*
1656 ,,	Harrington's *Oceana.*
1695 ,,	John Bellers' *Colleges of Industry*, etc. (on Communistic basis).
1754 ,,	Rousseau's *Discours sur l'inégalité.*
1755 ,,	Morelly's *Code de la Nature.*
1759 ,,	Fettiplace Bellers' *On the Ends of Society.*
1761 ,,	Wallace's *Various Prospects of Mankind, Nature, and Providence.*
1762 ,,	Rousseau's *Contrat Sociale.*
1769 ,,	Turgot's *Réflections sur la formation et distribution des richesses.*
1775 ,,	Spence's *Land Nationalisation.*
1776 ,,	Brissot de Warville's *Recherches philosophiques sur la propriéte et sur le vol.*

1780 A.D. Boissel's *Catechism du genre Humaine.*
1789 ,, Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Woman.*
1790 ,, Fauchet's *Bouche de fer* (a Christian Communist paper).
1793 ,, Godwin's *An Enquiry concerning Political Justice.*
1794 ,, Babœuf's *Tribune du Peuple* (first secular Socialistic newspaper).
1794 ,, Paine's *Rights of Man.*

(2) *The Nineteenth Century.*

See the following Chart.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALISM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. BY COUNTRIES.

	Great Britain.	France.	Germany.	The United States.	Other Countries.	Literature.
1800	1800 Robert Owen buys the New Lanark mills. 1802 First Factory Bill brought in by Sir Robert Peel, sen. 1807 Abolition of Slave Trade.	1799 REVOL. ends, w. Napol. as (1804) Empr. 1808 Fourier's *Theorie des Quatre Mouvements.*	Napoleonic Wars. 1807 Stein-Hardenberg Legislation.	Jeffersonian Democracy. 1803 Harmonist Community. 1806 Shakers commence Communism.		1808 Fourier's *Theory of Four Movements.*
1810	1813 Repeal of law whereby Justices fixed wages. 1817 PLAN OF SOCIALIST COMMUNITY LAID BEFORE PARLIAMENT BY OWEN.	1817 Saint-Simon's *L'Industrie.* ,, Lamennais' "Indifference in Matters of Religion".	1819 Gall, "First German Socialist," gives up his position to agitate for Communism.	1812 War with Great Britain. 1817 Zoar Community.		1817 Saint-Simon's *Industry.* Lamennais' first book. Owen's "Observations on the Effect of the Manufacturing System".
1820	1824 Repeal of Combination Laws, due to Francis Place and Joseph Hume. 1825, partly renewed. 1829 Carlyle's *Signs of Times.*	1825 Saint-Simon's *Nouveau Christianisme.* 1828 Bazard lectures on Saint-Simonianism.	1820 Fichte's *Stäatslehre.* 1821 Hegel's *Philosophie du Droit.* 1826 Von Thünen's "Der Isoliete Staat". 1828 Gall's "Menschenfreundliche Blätter".	1824 New Harmony Community (Owen).	1828 Buonarrotti's "History of Babœuvism" (Brussels).	1820 Fichte's *Science of State.* 1821 Hegel's *Philosophy of Right.* 1825 Saint-Simon's *New Christianity.* 1828 Gall's "Humanitarian Leaflets". 1828 Thünen's "The Isolated State". 1829 Carlyle's "Signs of Times".
1830	1832 Reform Bill. 1834 New Poor Law. Grand National Consolidated Trades Union. 1835 Owen's Association of all Classes of all Nations. THE WORD "SOCIALISM" FIRST GENERALLY USED. 1837-1848 Chartist Agitation. 1839 Bray's "Labour's Wrongs and Remedy".	1830 Bazard and Enfantin found a community at Menilmontant. ,, July Revolution in Paris. ,, Lamennais' *L'Avenir.* 1830-42 Comte's *Cours de Philosophie Positive.* 1834 Considerant's *Destinée Sociale*, and estab. of a phalanx. 1839 Insurrection organised by Blanqui.	1834 Huber's *Janus.* 1838 Weitling's *Die Menschheit wie sie ist und wie sie sein sollte.*	1835 Ten Hour Agitation.	1832 Mazzini's Young Italy in Marseilles. 1835 Colins' *Le Pacte Sociale.* 1838 Grutliverein established in Switzerland.	1830 Lamennais' *The Future.* 1830-42 Comte's *System of Positive Philosophy.* 1833 Colins' "Social Compact". 1834 Lamennais' "Words of a Believer". 1837 Owen's *Formation of Human Character.* 1838 Hüber's "Janus". Weitling's "World as it is, etc.". 1839 Carlyle's "Chartism".
1840	1844 Rochdale P[illegible]eers co-operate. 18[illegible] [illegible]epeal of Corn Laws. 1847 Ten Hours' Bill. 1848 Chartism collapses. ,, Christian Socialists organise. ,, Mill's *Political Economy.*	1840 Proudhon's *Qu'est que la Propriété?* ,, Blanc's *Organisation du Travail.* ,, Cabet's *Icarie.* 1842 Le Claire begins Profit Sharing. 1848 REVOLUTION. Republic proclaimed. Socialists demand State work-shops. Government plot to make them fail exposed by Blanc.	1842 Marx's *Rheinische Zeitung.* Rodbertus. 1848 REVOLUTION. Marx's "Neue Rhein. Zeitung". Lassalle at Düsseldorf insurrection. Bp. Ketteler's "Cath. Christ. Socialism". Germ. Assembly at Frankft., followed by Lib. State Constitutions enfranchising working men.	1840 Brisbane's *Social Destiny of Man.* 1842 Amana Community (Buffalo). 1844 Fourierist Convention. 1845 First National Industrial Congress. 1847 Oneida Community. 1849 Weitling's Socialistic Arbeiterbund in New York.	1845 Burkli begins agitation for Socialism in Switzerland. 1847 Communist League in London, for which 1848 MARX AND ENGELS ISSUE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO FROM BRUSSELS.	1840 Cabet's "Icaria". ,, Blanc's "Organisation of Labour". ,, Brisbane's "Social Destiny of Man". ,, Proudhon's *What is Property?* 1842 Rodbertus' "Our Knowledge of Economics". ,, Reybaud's "Modern Socialists". 1845 Engels' "Condition of the Working Classes". 1848 Mill's "Political Economy". ,, Marx and Engels' *Communist Manifesto.* 1849 English Christian Socialists. Politics for People. Kingsley's "Alton Locke," "Yeast".
1850	1852 Amalgamated Society of Engineers.	1851 Coup d'État and Second Empire. 1856 Le Play's "Société Internationale des Etudes Pratiques". 1859 Familistère at Guise.	1850 Schulze-Delitzsch's First Credit Association.	1850 Turnvereine, Socialistic.	1856 Eight Hours' Day in Australia, April 22.	1850 Winkelblach's "System of Economics". 1855 Le Play's "European Workmen".
1860	1860 First London Trades Council. 1862 Ruskin's *Unto this Last.* 1864 THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANISED IN LONDON, SEPTEMBER 28. 1867 Marx's *Kapital.* ,, Reform Bill.	1864 Coalition legalised for workmen. INTERNATIONAL SPREADS.	1862 LASSALLE'S BERLIN ADDRESS, APRIL 12. 1863 UNIV. GERMAN WORKING MAN'S ASSOCIATION. 1864 Lassalle's death, Aug. 31. 1869 SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC WORKING MAN'S PARTY.	1861-65 War of Rebellion. 1866 National Labour Party (trades union federation) formed. 1867 Emancipation of Slaves, Jan. 1. ,, International introduced. 1869 Boston Eight Hour League.	1866 Congress of International. 1867 ,, ,, Lausanne. 1868 ,, ,, Brussels. 1869 ,, ,, Basle.	1861 Perin's "Wealth in Christian Societies". 1862 Ruskin's "Unto this Last". 1863 Lassalle's "Might and Right". 1864 Le Play's *Social Reform.* 1867 Marx's *Capital.*
1870	1871 Trades Unions fully legalised. 1874 First Labour Members in Parliament. 1875 Last Combination Clauses repealed. 1877 Guild of St. Matthew (Christian Socialist).	1871 Paris COMMUNE. Comte de Mun's *Catholic Christian Socialism.* 1874 French Socialist MANIFESTO. 1876 Guisde returns to Paris and advocates Socialism. 1879 Amnesty to Communards.	1871 Socialist vote, 124,655. ,, German Empire proclaimed. 1872 Socialism of the Chair voiced at Eisenach. 1875 GOTHA CONGRESS. Union of followers of Marx and of Lassalle. 1877 Stöcker's paternal State Christian Socialism. 1878 Anti-Socialist Law. ,, Paternal State Insurance proposed. ,, Socialist vote, 437,158.	1872 General Council of International transferred to New York. 1877 SOCIALIST LABOUR PARTY FORMED. ,, Henry George's *Progress and Poverty.* ,, Great Railroad Strikes. 1878 1st General Assembly of the Knights of Labour.	1870 Congress at Paris prevented by war. 1872 CONGRESS OF INTERNATIONAL AT HAGUE. Anarchists and Socialists separate. 1879 Vooruit founded at Ghent. ,, Nieuwenhuis founds *Recht voor Allen* (Holland).	1870 Wagner's "The Abolition of Private Property". 1871 Godin's "Social Solutions". 1872 Socialists of the Chair at Eisenach. 1874 Laveleye's "Primitive Property" (French). ,, Mill's "Chapters on Socialism" ("Fort. Rev."). 1875 Schmoller's "Fundamental Questions". ,, Schäffle's "Quintessence of Socialism" (German). 1877 George's *Progress and Poverty.* 1879 Most's "Freiheit".
1880	1881 Henry George in England. ,, Democratic Federation formed. Called— 1883 SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION. ,, FABIAN SOCIETY FORMED. 1885 Socialist League. 1886 Hyde Park and Trafalgar Square "Riots". 1888 County Council Bill. 1889 DOCK STRIKE. ,, *Fabian Essays.*	1880 Malon founds *Le Parti Ouvrier.* ,, Congress at Havre. Socialists and Anarchists separate. 1882 Broussist section formed. 1883 Anarchist Riots. 1887 Labour Syndicate at Paris. 1889 Socialist vote, 91,000.	1881 Socialist vote, 311,961. 1884 Socialist vote, 649,990. 1887 Socialist vote, 763,128.	1880 American Federation of Labour formed. 1883 Anarchists and Socialists separate. 1886 Haymarket Sq. Riot, Chicago. George nom. mayor in N. Y. 1887 Four Anarchists hanged. Soc'sts and Single Taxers separate. 1888 Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, and *Nationalist Movement.* 1888 Christian Socialists organise.	1883 Socialist Congress at Copenhagen. ,, Socialist Democratic Labour Party in Spain. 1885 Labour Party (Socialist) in Belgium. 1887 Swiss Social Democratic Party. 1888 Swiss Workmen's State Secretary elected. ,, Austrian Socialist Congress at Hainfeld. ,, International Congress, London. 1889 ,, ,, Paris. ,, Socialist Congress in Sweden.	1881 Hyndman's *England for All.* 1882 Wallace's *Land Nationalisation.* 1883 Bebel's "Woman and Socialism". ,, Carpenter's "Towards Democracy". 1884 Morris' "Art and Socialism". ,, Gronlund's "Co-operative Commonwealth". 1886 Burns' "Man with the Red Flag". 1887 Kirkup's "Inquiry into Socialism". ,, Bellamy's *Looking Backward.* 1888 Morris' "Dream of John Ball". 1889 Carpenter's "Civilisation; its Cause and Cure". ,, *Fabian Essays.*
1890	1890 New Unionism spreads. 1891 Liberal Party Newcastle Programme. 1892 INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY. 1893 Trades Union Congress; Collectivist majority. 1894 Parish Councils Act. ,, Report of Royal Commission on Labour.	1891 Socialist vote, 549,000. 1893 Socialist vote, (about) 900,000. 1894 Anarchist Outrages and Repressive Legislation.	1890 Anti-Socialist Law expires. ,, Socialist vote, 1,427,298. 1893 Socialist vote, 1,876,738. ,, Conflict over Army Bill.	1891 People's Party formed. 1892 Homestead Strike. 1894 Pullman Strike.	1890 Great Strike in Australia. 1891 Labour Parties in Australia successful. ,, Socialistic "Partito dei Lavoratori" in Italy. ,, International Congress (Socialist), Brussels. 1893 ,, ,, ,, Zurich. ,, Universal Strike wins Universal Suffrage, Belgium. 1894 Socialist Organisations suppressed in Italy.	1890 Wm. Booth's "In Darkest England". 1891-94 Bellamy's "New Nation". 1891 Hertzka's "Freeland". 1892 Morris' *News from Nowhere.* ,, C. Booth's "Labour and Life of the People," 1st vol. ,, Engels' *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific.* 1893 Morris and Bax's "Socialism: its Growth and Outcome". ,, Schulze-Gävernitz's *Social Peace.* 1894 Kidd's *Social Evolution.* ,, Webb's "History of Trades Unionism". ,, German and English Handbooks of Socialism.
1900						

Important Events in Capitals.

Important Books in Italics.

The Encyclopædia of Social Reform.

Biographical, Bibliographical, Historical, Topical: embracing Political Economy, Political Science, Sociology; Treating of Anarchism, Charity Organisation, Co-operation, Currency, Individualism, Land Reform, Municipalism, Penalogy, Socialism, Social Purity, Temperance, Trade Unionism, Women's Suffrage, etc., etc.

W. D. P. BLISS, EDITOR.

Prefaced with the Co-operation of many Specialists

AMONGST WHOM ARE:—

Pres. E. B. Andrews, D.D., LL.D.; Edward Atkinson; Rachel Foster Avery; Prof. E. W. Bemis, Ph.D.; Edward Bellamy; A. A. Carlton; John Storer Cobb; Prof. J. R. Commons; Col. Albert Clarke; Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D.; Prof. R. P Falkner, Ph.D.; William Lloyd Garrison; Prof. Eleanor L. Lord; Wm. D. McCrackan; George E. NcNeill; Rev. A. A. Miner, D.D.; Rev. A. M. Powell, D.D.; James B. Reynolds, Ph.D.; Mrs. Frances E. Russell; Thomas G. Shearman; Joseph D. Weeks; Arthur B. Woodford, Ph.D.; Robert A. Woods; Carroll D. Wright, etc., etc.

AMONG THE ENGLISH CONTRIBUTORS ARE:—

Canon S. A. Barnett; Miss Helen Blackburn; Wm. Clark; Rev. Stewart D. Headlam; Auberon Herbert; Benjamin Kidd; Keir Hardie; John Trevor; C. H. Shillinglaw; Fred. Verinder; J. B. Wallace; Sidney Webb.

All reforms are treated here by their advocates, with the opposing view stated by some opponent. The biographical and historical articles are particularly full. The general aim is, while avoiding academic style, to go on each subject to the best authorities. The Encyclopædia will be reliable, and the only complete work of its kind ever issued.

Every Student of Social Subjects will need it.

Large 8vo; cloth. About 1000 pp. Price $6.00.
Over 900 Articles.

READY—SUMMER OF 1895.

NEW YORK:
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY,
LONDON. 1895. TORONTO.

SOCIAL SCIENCE SERIES.

SCARLET CLOTH, EACH 2s. 6d.

---

1. **Work and Wages.** Prof. J. E. Thorold Rogers.
   "Nothing that Professor Rogers writes can fail to be of interest to thoughtful people."—*Athenæum.*
2. **Civilisation: its Cause and Cure.** Edward Carpenter.
   "No passing piece of polemics, but a permanent possession."—*Scottish Review.*
3. **Quintessence of Socialism.** Dr. Schäffle.
   "Precisely the manual needed. Brief, lucid, fair and wise."—*British Weekly.*
4. **Darwinism and Politics.** D. G. Ritchie, M.A. (Oxon.).
   New Edition, with two additional Essays on Human Evolution.
   "One of the most suggestive books we have met with."—*Literary World.*
5. **Religion of Socialism.** E. Belfort Bax.
6. **Ethics of Socialism.** E. Belfort Bax.
   "Mr. Bax is by far the ablest of the English exponents of Socialism."—*Westminster Review.*
7. **The Drink Question.** Dr. Kate Mitchell.
   "Plenty of interesting matter for reflection. '—*Graphic.*
8. **Promotion of General Happiness.** Prof. M. Macmillan.
   "A reasoned account of the most advanced and most enlightened utilitarian doctrine in a clear and readable form."—*Scotsman.*
9. **England's Ideal, &c.** Edward Carpenter.
   "The literary power is unmistakable, their freshness of style, their humour, and their enthusiasm."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*
10. **Socialism in England.** Sidney Webb, LL.B.
    "The best general view of the subject from the modern Socialist side."—*Athenæum.*
11. **Prince Bismarck and State Socialism.** W. H. Dawson.
    "A succinct, well-digested review of German social and economic legislation since 1870."—*Saturday Review.*
12. **Godwin's Political Justice (On Property).** Edited by H. S. Salt.
    "Shows Godwin at his best; with an interesting and informing introduction."—*Glasgow Herald.*
13. **The Story of the French Revolution.** E. Belfort Bax.
    "A trustworthy outline."—*Scotsman.*
14. **The Co-Operative Commonwealth.** Laurence Gronlund.
    "An independent exposition of the Socialism of the Marx school."—*Contemporary Review.*
15. **Essays and Addresses.** Bernard Bosanquet, M.A. (Oxon.).
    "Ought to be in the hands of every student of the Nineteenth Century spirit."—*Echo.*
    "No one can complain of not being able to understand what Mr. Bosanquet means."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*
16. **Charity Organisation.** C. S. Loch, Secretary to Charity Organisation Society.
    "A perfect little manual."—*Athenæum.*
    "Deserves a wide circulation."—*Scotsman.*
17. **Thoreau's Anti-Slavery and Reform Papers.** Edited by H. S. Salt.
    "An interesting collection of essays."—*Literary World.*
18. **Self-Help a Hundred Years Ago.** G. J. Holyoake.
    "Will be studied with much benefit by all who are interested in the amelioration of the condition of the poor."—*Morning Post.*
19. **The New York State Reformatory at Elmira.** Alexander Winter.
    With Preface by Havelock Ellis.
    "A valuable contribution to the literature of penology."—*Black and White.*

SOCIAL SCIENCE SERIES—(*Continued*).

20. **Common Sense about Women.** T. W. HIGGINSON.

"An admirable collection of papers, advocating in the most liberal spirit the emancipation of women."—*Woman's Herald.*

21. **The Unearned Increment.** W. H. DAWSON.

"A concise but comprehensive volume."—*Echo.*

22. **Our Destiny.** LAURENCE GRONLUND.

"A very vigorous little book, dealing with the influence of Socialism on morals and religion."—*Daily Chronicle.*

23. **The Working-Class Movement in America.** Dr. EDWARD and E. MARX AVELING.

"Will give a good idea of the condition of the working classes in America, and of the various organisations which they have formed."—*Scots Leader.*

24. **Luxury.** Prof. EMILE DE LAVELEYE.

"An eloquent plea on moral and economical grounds for simplicity of life."—*Academy.*

25. **The Land and the Labourers.** Rev. C. W. STUBBS, M.A.

"This admirable book should be circulated in every village in the country."—*Manchester Guardian.*

26. **The Evolution of Property.** PAUL LAFARGUE.

"Will prove interesting and profitable to all students of economic history."—*Scotsman.*

27. **Crime and its Causes.** W. DOUGLAS MORRISON.

"Can hardly fail to suggest to all readers several new and pregnant reflections on the subject."—*Anti-Jacobin.*

28. **Principles of State Interference.** D. G. RITCHIE, M.A.

"An interesting contribution to the controversy on the functions of the State."—*Glasgow Herald.*

29. **German Socialism and F. Lassalle.** W. H. DAWSON.

"As a biographical history of German Socialistic movements during this century it may be accepted as complete."—*British Weekly.*

30. **The Purse and the Conscience.** H. M. THOMPSON, B.A. (Cantab.).

"Shows common sense and fairness in his arguments."—*Scotsman.*

31. **Origin of Property in Land.** FUSTEL DE COULANGES. Edited, with an Introductory Chapter on the English Manor, by Prof. W. J. ASHLEY, M.A.

"His views are clearly stated, and are worth reading."—*Saturday Review.*

32. **The English Republic.** W. J. LINTON. Edited by KINETON PARKES.

"Characterised by that vigorous intellectuality which has marked his long life of literary and artistic activity."—*Glasgow Herald.*

33. **The Co-Operative Movement.** BEATRICE POTTER.

"Without doubt the ablest and most philosophical analysis of the Co-Operative Movement which has yet been produced."—*Speaker.*

34. **Neighbourhood Guilds.** Dr. STANTON COIT.

"A most suggestive little book to anyone interested in the social question."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

35. **Modern Humanists.** J. M. ROBERTSON.

"Mr. Robertson's style is excellent—nay, even brilliant—and his purely literary criticisms bear the mark of much acumen."—*Times.*

36. **Outlooks from the New Standpoint.** E. BELFORT BAX.

"Mr. Bax is a very acute and accomplished student of history and economics." —*Daily Chronicle.*

37. **Distributing Co-Operative Societies.** Dr. LUIGI PIZZAMIGLIO. Edited by F. J. SNELL.

"Dr. Pizzamiglio has gathered together and grouped a wide array of facts and statistics, and they speak for themselves."—*Speaker.*

38. **Collectivism and Socialism.** By A. NACQUET. Edited by W. HEAFORD.

"An admirable criticism by a well-known French politician of the New Socialism of Marx and Lassalle."—*Daily Chronicle.*

SOCIAL SCIENCE SERIES—(*Continued*).

39. **The London Programme.** SIDNEY WEBB, LL.B.
"Brimful of excellent ideas."—*Anti-Jacobin.*

40. **The Modern State.** PAUL LEROY BEAULIEU.
"A most interesting book; well worth a place in the library of every social inquirer."—*N. B. Economist.*

41. **The Condition of Labour.** HENRY GEORGE.
"Written with striking ability, and sure to attract attention."—*Newcastle Chronicle.*

42. **The Revolutionary Spirit preceding the French Revolution.**
FELIX ROCQUAIN. With a Preface by Professor HUXLEY.
"The student of the French Revolution will find in it an excellent introduction to the study of that catastrophe."—*Scotsman.*

43. **The Student's Marx.** EDWARD AVELING, D.Sc.
"One of the most practically useful of any in the Series."—*Glasgow Herald.*

44. **A Short History of Parliament.** B. C. SKOTTOWE, M.A. (Oxon.).
"Deals very carefully and completely with this side of constitutional history."—*Spectator.*

45. **Poverty: Its Genesis and Exodus.** J. G. GODARD.
"He states the problems with great force and clearness."—*N. B. Economist.*

46. **The Trade Policy of Imperial Federation.** MAURICE H. HERVEY.
"An interesting contribution to the discussion."—*Publishers' Circular.*

47. **The Dawn of Radicalism.** J. BOWLES DALY, LL.D.
"Forms an admirable picture of an epoch more pregnant, perhaps, with political instruction than any other in the world's history."—*Daily Telegraph.*

48. **The Destitute Alien in Great Britain.** ARNOLD WHITE; MONTAGUE CRACKANTHORPE, Q.C.; W. A. M'ARTHUR, M.P.; W. H. WILKINS, &c.
"Much valuable information concerning a burning question of the day."—*Times.*

49. **Illegitimacy and the Influence of Seasons on Conduct.**
ALBERT LEFFINGWELL, M.D.
"We have not often seen a work based on statistics which is more continuously interesting."—*Westminster Review.*

50. **Commercial Crises of the Nineteenth Century.** H. M. HYNDMAN.
"One of the best and most permanently useful volumes of the Series."—*Literary Opinion.*

51. **The State and Pensions in Old Age.** J. A. SPENDER and ARTHUR ACLAND, M.P.
"A careful and cautious examination of the question."—*Times.*

52. **The Fallacy of Saving.** JOHN M. ROBERTSON.
"A plea for the reorganisation of our social and industrial system."—*Speaker.*

53. **The Irish Peasant.** ANON.
"A real contribution to the Irish Problem by a close, patient and dispassionate investigator."—*Daily Chronicle.*

54. **The Effects of Machinery on Wages.** Prof. J. S. NICHOLSON, D.Sc.
"Ably reasoned, clearly stated, impartially written."—*Literary World.*

55. **The Social Horizon.** ANON.
"A really admirable little book, bright, clear, and unconventional."—*Daily Chronicle.*

56. **Socialism, Utopian and Scientific.** FREDERICK ENGELS.
"The body of the book is still fresh and striking."—*Daily Chronicle.*

57. **Land Nationalisation.** A. R. WALLACE.
"The most instructive and convincing of the popular works on the subject."—*National Reformer.*

58. **The Ethic of Usury and Interest.** Rev. W. BLISSARD.
"The work is marked by genuine ability."—*North British Agriculturalist.*

59. **The Emancipation of Women.** ADELE CREPAZ.
"By far the most comprehensive, luminous, and penetrating work on this question that I have yet met with."—*Extract from* Mr. GLADSTONE'S *Preface.*

60. **The Eight Hours' Question.** JOHN M. ROBERTSON
"A very cogent and sustained argument on what is at present the unpopular side."—*Times.*

61. **Drunkenness.** GEORGE R. WILSON, M.B.
"Well written, carefully reasoned, free from cant, and full of sound sense."—*National Observer.*

62. **The New Reformation.** RAMSDEN BALMFORTH.
"A striking presentation of the nascent religion, how best to realize the personal and social ideal."—*Westminster Review.*

63. **The Agricultural Labourer.** T. E. KEBBEL.
"A short summary of his position, with appendices on wages, education, allotments, etc., etc."

64. **Ferdinand Lassalle as a Social Reformer.** E. BERNSTEIN.
"A worthy addition to the Social Science Series."—*North British Economist.*

SOCIAL SCIENCE SERIES—(*Continued*).

65. **England's Foreign Trade in XIXth Century.** A. L. Bowley.
"Full of valuable information, carefully compiled."—*Times.*

66. **Theory and Policy of Labour Protection.** Dr. Schäffle.
"An attempt to systematize a conservative programme of reform."—*Man. Guard.*

67. **History of Rochdale Pioneers.** G. J. Holyoake.
"Brought down from 1844 to the Rochdale Congress of 1892."—*Co-Op. News.*

68. **Rights of Women.** M. Ostragorski.
"An admirable storehouse of precedents, conveniently arranged."—*Daily Chron.*

69. **Dwellings of the People.** Locke Worthington.
"A valuable contribution to one of the most pressing problems of the day."—*Daily Chron.*

70. **Hours, Wages, and Production.** Dr. Brentano.
"Characterised by all Professor Brentano's clearness of style."—*Economic Review.*

71. **Rise of Modern Democracy.** Ch. Borgeaud.
"A very useful little volume, characterised by exact research."—*Daily Chron.*

72. **Land Systems of Australasia.** Wm. Epps.
"Exceedingly valuable at the present time of depression and difficulty."—*Scots. Mag.*

73. **The Tyranny of Socialism.** Yves Guyot. Pref. by J. H. Levy.
"M. Guyot is smart, lively, trenchant, and interesting."—*Daily Chronicle.*

74. **Population and the Social System.** Dr. Nith.
"A very valuable work of an Italian economist."—*West. Rev.*

75. **The Labour Question.** T. G. Spyers.
"Will be found extremely useful."—*Times.*

76. **British Freewomen.** C. C. Stopes.
"The most complete study of the Women's Suffrage question."—*English Wom. Rev.*

77. **Suicide and Insanity.** Dr. J. K. Strahan.
"An interesting monograph dealing exhaustively with the subject."—*Times.*

78. **A History of Tithes.** Rev. H. W. Clarke.
"May be recommended to all who desire an accurate idea of the subject."—*D. Chron.*

79. **Three Months in a Workshop.** P. Göhre, with Pref. by Prof. Ely.
"A vivid picture of the state of mind of German workmen."—*Manch. Guard.*

80. **Darwinism and Race Progress.** Prof. J. B. Haycraft.
"An interesting subject treated in an attractive fashion."—*Glasgow Herald.*

DOUBLE VOLUMES, Each 3s. 6d.

1. **Life of Robert Owen.** Lloyd Jones.
"A worthy record of a life of noble activities."—*Manchester Examiner.*

2. **The Impossibility of Social Democracy**; a Second Part of "The Quintessence of Socialism." Dr. A. Schäffle.
"Extremely valuable as a criticism of Social Democracy."—*Inter. J. of Ethics.*

3. **The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844.** Fredk. Engels.
"A translation of a work written in 1845, with a preface written in 1892."

4. **The Principles of Social Economy.** Yves Guyot.
"An interesting and suggestive work."—*Spectator.*

5. **Social Peace.** Dr. Schulze-Gaevernitz. Edited by Graham-Wallas.
"A study by a competent observer of the industrial movement."—*Times.*

SWAN SONNENSCHEIN & CO., LONDON.
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

Date Due

AP 25 '51

[illegible]

[illegible]

APR 10 199[redacted]

HX40 .B64
A handbook of socialism: a statement of
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00025 7222